

THE MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

*A QUARTERLY JOURNAL EDITED FOR THE
MODERN HUMANITIES RESEARCH ASSOCIATION..*

BY

CHARLES J. SISSON
WILLIAM J. ENTWISTLE

AND

H. G. ATKINS



LONDON

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

CHICAGO: The University of Chicago Press
(AGENTS FOR THE UNITED STATES)

BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, MADRAS: Macmillan

All rights reserved

Price Seven Shillings net

Annual Subscription, 25s. net post free

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

	PAGE
Erasmus and Propaganda. By MARGARET MANN PHILLIPS	1
The Second Part of 'Tamburlaine the Great'. By HELEN L. GARDNER . .	18
Notes on Early Stuart Stage History. By C. J. SISSON	25
Rousseau and the Romantic Experience. By L. A. BISSON	37
Rimbaud—Michelet—Vico. By MARGARET I. CLARKE	50
Herder and Pascal. By A. GILLIES	56
Alternation of Personality in the Dramas of Heinrich von Kleist and Zacharias Werner. By RALPH TYMMS	64

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

A fragment of the Old French romance 'Paris et Vienne'. By O. A. BECKERLEGGE.—Goethe's Application for the Copyright of the Final Edition of his Collected Works (Ausgabe letzter Hand). By H. G. FIEDLER	74
---	----

REVIEWS

W. J. Entwistle, <i>European Balladry</i> (N. K. CHADWICK).—J. E. B. Gover, A. Mawer and F. M. Stenton, <i>The Place-Names of Nottinghamshire</i> (D. WHITELOCK).—F. S. Boas, <i>Christopher Marlowe</i> (M. ECCLES).—W. W. Greg, <i>The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear'</i> (J. G. McMANAWAY).—G. E. Bentley, <i>The Jacobean and Caroline Stage. Dramatic Companies and Players</i> (C. J. SISSON).—C. D. Thorpe, <i>The Aesthetic Theory of Thomas Hobbes</i> (R. I. AARON).—P. B. Gove, <i>The Imaginary Voyage in Prose Fiction</i> (GWYN JONES).—H. F. Stewart, <i>The Secret of Pascal</i> (N. ABERCROMBIE).—C. I. Silin, <i>Benserade and his ballets de cour</i> (F. C. ROE).—H. J. Hunt, <i>The Epic in Nineteenth-Century France</i> (H. F. STEWART).—G. Lemaître, <i>André Maurois</i> (F. C. ROE).—A. Blunt, <i>Artistic Theory in Italy, 1450-1600</i> (J. H. WHITFIELD).— <i>Quatro Comedias</i> , ed. by J. M. Hill and M. M. Harlan (W. J. ENTWISTLE).— <i>Der arme Heinrich, a Poem by Hartman van Ouwte</i> , ed. by J. K. Bostock (A. C. DUNSTAN).— <i>Corona</i> , ed. by A. Schirokauer and W. Paulsen (W. E. COLLINSON).—J. Bithell, <i>An Anthology of German Poetry, 1880-1940</i> (R. PEACOCK)	79
--	----

SHORT NOTICES

<i>Work in Progress, 1941</i> , ed. by J. M. Osborn and D. R. Korr (C. J. SISSON).—W. W. Greg, <i>Ronald Brunlees McKerrow</i> (C. J. SISSON).—F. P. Wilson, <i>Shakespeare and the Diction of Common Life</i> (C. J. SISSON).— <i>Observations upon a late Label</i> , ed. by H. Macdonald (G. KITCHIN).— <i>Studies for William A. Read</i> (W. M. T. DODDS).—H. C. Lancaster, <i>The Comédie Française, 1680-1701</i> (L. A. BISSON).—H. Hermannsson, <i>Illuminated Manuscripts of the Jónsbók</i> (E. C. BATHO)	106
--	-----

NEW PUBLICATIONS (July-September 1941)	111
--	-----

ERASMUS AND PROPAGANDA

A STUDY OF THE TRANSLATIONS OF ERASMUS
IN ENGLISH AND FRENCH

FEW single authors can have been as much translated, at such different times and for such different purposes, as Erasmus. The history of the translations of his works in English and French alone shows a constant popularity, and a constant attempt on the part of successive generations to enlist him as a supporter for their most cherished opinions. He was never out of date; his personality, shrouded in its Latin dress or not, appealed increasingly, and the nature of the appeal varied in a way which illustrates the real preoccupations of succeeding ages. In a word, the translations belong for the most part to the class of propagandist literature, and as such they throw a certain light on public opinion as well as on the many facets of a subtle individual mind.

One may say that two periods have known Erasmus in a balanced and coherent way—his age and our own. With the latter this paper is not concerned, as the question becomes a different one as soon as research in the modern sense begins to be applied to Erasmus and his works. In surveying the field up to the mid-nineteenth century, we are left with the picture of one century which knew him more or less completely, and some two hundred and fifty years during which interest in him was continuous but partial and changing. It may be as well, before setting out on an account of the translations, to call to mind what Erasmus meant to his own time, before ardent partisanship and the growth of legend had emphasized certain aspects of his work to the detriment of others.

The four main sources of his appeal were naturally bound to be reflected unequally in vernacular literature. The most important for his own age, Biblical learning and exegesis, depending as it did on his editions of the New Testament and the Fathers, his *Paraphrases* and treatises, could have no effect on popular literature except indirectly, where others such as Lefèvre d'Étaples or Olivétan or Coverdale were to utilize his work for their vulgarization of the Bible. For the general public his attitude to religion was expressed in short essays of a devotional character, like the famous *Enchiridion Multis Christiani*, which had over seventy Latin editions in the course of the sixteenth century, but was also translated into eight modern languages before 1590. There the

unlettered saw the fruits of his Biblical research: a simplified Christianity, peaceful in the midst of war and in harmony with the classical ideal.

This second important characteristic, the enthusiasm of the humanist for classical learning, impregnated his whole output from the early poems and Platonic dialogues to the later translations of Euripides, and those books which found their way earliest into the vulgar tongue, such as the *Colloquies* and some of the *Adagia*. As in the case of Montaigne, the comments on the Adages began as simple notes on classical subjects and blossomed out into full-blown essays on current controversies, and in both forms were partially known to the non-Latin reading public.

More attractive to the less educated reader was the journalistic side of Erasmus, his sarcasms on current abuses, his dialogues after the manner of Lucian which put the whole contemporary world on to the stage, his practical vision of some types of social reform. Here lay part of his mystery, according to their views, the readers regarded him as too Protestant or not Protestant enough, and associated him with one aspect or another of their struggle. What made them all uncomfortable was the impression, formulated most clearly by Calvin, that Erasmus was, if not a Gallio, at least less interested than he ought to have been in the serious dogmatic aspect of the contemporary controversy. Articles of faith seemed to matter less to him than the destruction of life and culture that their championship entailed. This aspect of his character has become clearer throughout the years.

Finally, there was the pure humorist, cracking his jokes at pedants and tyrants in the first place, but also perhaps at the universal inescapable foolishness of the whole human race.

In short, devotional works, classical learning, social and religious reform, and light literature,—each in turn and all together were to be found in his vast production. And the translators called on all these at different times. As a general rule, it may be said that the interest of the sixteenth century was centred on the devotional side and on those writings which could be used as weapons by the reformers; that the seventeenth century used Erasmus for the vulgarization of learning and the *Colloquies* as a school book, but also roped him into their religious and political controversies, and on opposing sides; that the readers of the eighteenth century found the *Praise of Folly* exactly the sort of gilded pill they liked, and enjoyed the *Colloquies* for their funny side; and that the early nineteenth century gave great publicity to Erasmus the pacifist.

In the sixteenth century the position is as follows: a very large selection of Erasmus's works are to be found in translation, and many of these will never be translated into the vernacular again. This is especially true of the short meditations or treatises on religious subjects. The predominating interest of the century put into the hands of the people of England his commentaries on the Creed¹ and the 15th Psalm,² his essay *De immensa Dei misericordia*³ and his *Praeparatio ad mortem*;⁴ the *Paraphrases* were translated⁵ and the famous preface to the New Testament, the Paraclesis.⁶ In French there was a translation of his book on Confession dedicated by the translator to Marguerite de Navarre.⁷ The Paraclesis, the Creed, the Paternoster, the Preparation for Death also took on a French dress, the last in two different translations which are interesting to compare. One of them, published in 1539,⁸ was the work of a soldier and a humanist, Guy Morin; he dedicated his work to the widow of his old commander, and a poet famous in his day, François Sagon, added to the volume after the translator's death a biography in verse. In presentation and style the book is humanistic, printed in fine roman characters, a volume for a courtier's library. And the bias of the translation is Catholic. The second, printed in 1543,⁹ is anonymous, printed badly in cramped black-letter, not preserving the marginal notes of the original, and ending not with a handful of poems but with a collection of prayers. The style, when compared with Guy Morin's, is heavy, archaic and involved. The bias is Protestant. Both translations are accurate as far as their presentation of Erasmus's ideas goes, but the bias can be discerned by slight indications, by a single word often, as when Morin translates 'homines vere pii' by 'vrais catholiques' and the anonymous author inserts into a description of the blessed the one word 'élus'.

This seems to be a good illustration of the way in which short texts were used by the early reformers in France. The second translation was evidently made hurriedly with old type, and with no regard at all for the literary qualities of the original. It was the ideas that mattered, not the beauty of words; they needed weapons and not decorative language, so that the elegance of Erasmus and the fire of Luther were lost alike in these hasty secret renderings.

¹ *A playne and godly exposition...*, London, 1533.

² *An exposicion of the xv. psalme* .., London, 1537.

³ Translated by G. Hervet, 1533.

⁴ *Preparation to death*, London, 1543.

⁵ 1548.

⁶ 1529.

⁷ *Manière de se confesser*, tr. by Claude Chansonnette, 1524.

⁸ *Préparatif à la mort*, Paris, 1539.

⁹ *Préparation à la mort*, 1543.

The most famous of these religious treatises was the *Enchiridion*. This was translated into English and had a good deal of success; there were eleven editions.¹ In France a translation was made about 1529 and reprinted by Étienne Dolet; as the book was banned by the Sorbonne, this appears to have been one of the misdeeds that led him to the stake. Too much has been said about these translations elsewhere to expand on them much here;² but it is clear that the great attraction of Erasmus to the sixteenth century lay in his insistence on keeping the spirit rather than the letter of the law, which is at the basis of all these different writings. Whether he is talking about confession, prayer, the way to meet death or the Christian life in general, his burden is the same: you may pay your tithes like the Pharisee, but you neglect the weightier virtues of justice and charity.

There was too a whole succession of translations which owed their popularity to the passion of the century for collections and anthologies. The *Apophthegmata* ran into twenty-two editions in France, and an attempt was even made on the *Adagia* in England.³ On the other hand the *Praise of Folly*, so relished by later generations, only seems to have achieved one version in French and three in English. It was not that the taste of the time ran counter to such masterly fooling, for the Latin version sprang at once into popularity and stayed there; but in general the people who went to the trouble of translating Erasmus did so for very definite reasons, in this case for the purpose of spreading Protestant doctrine under a formidable name.

There are two notable examples here of different types of propaganda, both only too well known to us in our own day. On the one hand there was the direct kind, used to inculcate a certain mental attitude on behalf of the political or religious beliefs of the government in power. This was the use to which Erasmus's *Colloquies*, for instance, were put in England. De Vocht,⁴ in his study of the earliest English translations of the *Colloquies* between 1536 and 1566, shows very clearly how the translation of the 'Religious Pilgrimage' was used. It is one of the most famous of the dialogues, and remains one of the best known; and it describes a visit paid to Walsingham and to the shrine of St Thomas at Canterbury by Erasmus himself and a person who probably represents Colet. The companion argues with the officials who exhibit the relics at the shrine and

¹ The first translation, published by Wynkyn de Worde, dates from 1534.

² M. Mann, *Erasmus et les débuts de la Réforme française*, Paris, 1934.

³ Richard Taverner, *Proverbs or Adages gathered out of the chitades of Erasmus*, London, 1545.

⁴ H. de Vocht, *The Earliest English Translations of Erasmus' Colloquia*, 1536-1566, Louvain, 1928.

finally is threatened with being turned out for his impertinence. The English setting made the dialogue a perfect propaganda weapon, and the chance was not missed. It was published in translation, probably by the order of Thomas Cromwell, in 1536, during the Pilgrimage of Grace, with a preface alluding to 'this arrogant conspiracy'. According to de Vocht this *Pilgrimage of Pure Devocyon* was part of a campaign begun by the Injunctions of 1534 and pursued by tracts, ballads, lampoons, sermons from Bishops, and every other possible method. There is evidence that those who drew up the Articles of Enquiry for Walsingham were acquainted with Erasmus's caustic strictures.

The other type of propaganda found is the *secret* spreading of subversive views (or views considered so by the authorities) under a rigid censorship.¹ This was carried out in various ways, and may be illustrated by the translations of Erasmus attributed to Louis de Berquin in 1526. Erasmus persistently said that they were not his works at all, but doctored, and as Berquin was getting into serious trouble this led to some aspersions being cast on Erasmus's willingness to stand up for his friends. Actually, an analysis of the translations, which only exist in one copy, all Berquin's books having been burnt, shows that the versions are beautifully accurate, but interspersed with extracts from Luther and Farel. The work is so carefully done that the joints are imperceptible, and it takes a meticulous comparison with Erasmus's text to establish the fact that they are there.

At the end of the sixteenth century, if the translations are any guide at all, there seems to have been a drop in the popular interest in Erasmus. I have traced no new translations between 1576 and 1622, and it seems reasonable to think that while scholars like Montaigne, or the Elizabethan writers, continued to be profoundly influenced by Erasmus, the existing translations were considered adequate as far as the general public went, and no new axe to grind needed his collaboration.

The seventeenth century, in France, showed little enthusiasm, at least at the beginning. This was to be expected, since neither his religious views nor his critical attitude would appeal to a large section of the public. There is no landmark until the middle of the century, precisely 1642, when a new translation of the *Praise of Folly* appeared and ran into three

¹ It is curious to see one of the methods used being repeated by the Nazis as a preparation for their campaign. It may be remembered that the Arbed works in Luxembourg, which are accustomed to publish a report in the spring, kept it back in 1940 owing to the unusual conditions, and then to their great astonishment the directors of the concern learnt that the report had been published at the correct date and was being circulated in France under their name. It was interleaved with extracts from Hitler's speeches and various samples of persuasive literature. This system was tried in France in the sixteenth century, as is seen in the translations mentioned above.

editions.¹ It has a preface which trips obligingly from one leading idea of the age to another and seems to put Erasmus in connexion with them all. After a transparent allusion to the founder of Jansenism, whose book had been published in 1640 (and like this one, at The Hague), saying that he, like Erasmus, showed mankind to man in all its abasement, the translator goes on to comment on the use of guile in international politics, the foundation of the French Academy, the quarrel of the Ancients and Moderns; he says, for instance, that the learning of grammar is 'la seule cause des avantages que l'antiquité a remporté sur les esprits de notre siècle'. And finally he ends up in the true spirit of the Grand Siècle, deferent to women and disliking pedantry or specialization: the *Praise of Folly* is worth translating because this allows it to be read by two classes, soldiers and women, who will like it because it is so easy and yet so instructive!

Même cet agréable ouvrage qui ne porte sur le front une opulence dédaigneuse, ni une autorité stoïque, mais un titre qui dans son abord promet du divertissement, se peut insinuer dans les mains délicates des Dames, et trouver place avec bienséance dans les belles ruelles des lits.

Another lighter note was struck by translations of the *Colloquies*, published about this time, by a certain Samuel Chappuzeau,² a native of Geneva who came to seek his fortune in Paris and failed, went to Germany, wrote, taught, practised medicine and became governor to the pages of the Duke of Brunswick, and finally died in poverty. His translations of the *Colloquies* appear to have been of a pot-boiling nature, but one of them, which I have been unable to see but which is described at length in the *Bibliotheca Erasmiana*, would repay investigation.³ It is an attempt to make a play, or rather a series of dramatic interludes, out of four of Erasmus's *Colloquies*, the Inns, the Lover and Maiden, the Knight without a Horse, and the Parliament of Women. It is this last which gave to the translation the title of 'Le Cercle des Femmes', and it seems significant that such a subject should be chosen in 1656, when we remember that the *Précieuses Ridicules* dates from 1659 and the satirical *Dictionnaire des Précieuses* of Somaize from 1660. It may well have been in the advance guard of the attack on the salons.⁴

¹ *La Louange de la Sottise*, La Haye, 1642. Anon.

² *Bibliotheca Erasmiana*, vol. vi, pp. 96, 337.

³ This is not at present possible, as there are only two copies known to the editors, one at the Bibliothèque Nationale and one at Copenhagen.

⁴ Erasmus's dialogue is not satirical in its beginnings; he usually treats women with a seriousness and a spirit of equality which is unequalled by the feminist writings of the sixteenth century, even by Marguerite de Navarre. But half-way through the colloquy the tone changes, and the women who set out to prove their intellectual equality with men spend all the rest of the time discussing absurd questions of dress and precedence. There may be in the French text some enlightening variations on this theme. But according to the *Bibliotheca Erasmiana* the volume was not printed in Lyon as it claims but in Holland.

So far we have seen Erasmus mixed up with the most solemn and the most frivolous aspects of the seventeenth-century background, Janseñism and preciosity. But there were two conflicts, nearer the end of the century, in which his support would naturally be enlisted; these were, in France, the growing resistance to orthodoxy, or the libertin movement; in England, the Popish Plot and the possibilities of a Catholic revival.

There are many indications that the movement towards rationalism in matters of religion and philosophy, from 1660 onwards, was associated with the man who best represented the critical judgement of the Renaissance. The question is an involved one, and it need only be suggested here that it was natural that the apostles of incredulity should regard Erasmus as one of their leaders and pioneers, and yet how profoundly unjust such an estimate of him was! He had been popular in the sixteenth century as the advocate of a simpler faith, a more practical and childlike though completely non-mystical acceptance of the Christian creed. In the seventeenth century, it is already his sharp critical eye which gains him friends. The great standard edition of his works was published at Leyden from 1703 to 1706, just over the threshold of the century, by Jean Leclerc, himself a Socinian. Pierre Bayle fed the current of scepticism from his solitary room at Rotterdam, and put an engraving of the statue of Erasmus on the title-page of his *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*. Richard Simon translated and commented the text of Scripture, from a supposedly orthodox standpoint, but more ruthlessly rationalistic than any earlier editor's had been. He was condemned by Rome, and Bossuet, fulminating mightily in his *Défense de la Tradition des Saints Pères*, associated him with Erasmus under the same accusation of impertinence.¹ The general view of Erasmus's personality was changing to that held by the eighteenth century.

In England, there had been some early translations of the *Colloquies*, such as the one of 1606 with the charming title: *Utile-Dulce; or, Truths Libertie. Seven wittie-wise dialogues, full of delight, and fitte for use: verie applicable to these times, but seasonable for all ages, till Romes idolatrie, and womens delicacie, be reformed.*

But it was later on, when the Catholic question under the Restoration brought Erasmus into the welter of political warfare, that the *Colloquies* gained real popularity. He became sponsor for the orthodoxy of Sir Roger l'Estrange, pamphleteer, and public censor at the time of the Popish Plot. L'Estrange's character was a matter of violent discussion in his own day and seems to have remained an unsolved problem; he was prominent in

¹ Hazard, *Crise de la Conscience européenne*, Paris, 1935, p. 264 et seq.

some of the shadiest intrigues of his time, and the publication of the *Colloquies* in 1680 actually came at a moment when he had been obliged to quit the capital and go into hiding, and had been burnt in effigy in the streets of London. He wishes to create an illusion of tolerance by flying to Erasmus for support; and he affects to find himself exactly in the same position, regarded by one side as a Papist in disguise, by the other as a bigoted Protestant, and getting the worst of both worlds. Nothing could express this point of view more gracefully than his own neat preface.¹

These translations are among the best made. They belong to a time when English could be unbelievably light-handed, scathing, scurrilous on occasion, and it renders the swiftness and brilliance of Erasmus's Latin better than at any other stage. L'Estrange was a pithy writer, and his version of the *Colloquies* marks perhaps the only flight into literature with which this paper has to deal.

Curiously enough, and here I think is one of the choice examples of the ubiquity of our humanist, he was being used at much the same date, when L'Estrange's *Colloquies* were still in full swing, to further the opposite cause. There exists a volume² in French, printed at Cologne, and directed to the English public, entitled *Sentiments d'Erasmus de Rotterdam conformes à ceux de l'Eglise Catholique sur tous les points controversez*. The author signs himself J. Richard, prieur de Beaulieu, Sainte-Avoye, and dedicates his book to the King of England: the date is 1688. It has the most guileful preface, reminding James II how Erasmus has always been welcome in England, how he always combated heresy and declared himself a true subject of the Church of Rome, and an enemy of the enemies of the Pope, but how, since all extremes are dangerous, he also resisted the people who flattered the Pope by according to him an authority over Kings which he had not received from Christ.

An extract from the Preface will best show the object of this work:

C'est pourquoi, Siré, j'espère que votre Majesté donnant sa protection à cet Ouvrage, vos sujets le liront avec plaisir: qu'ils écouteront une voix amie, qui leur parle de la religion de leurs Pères; et qu'ils seront plus portés à imiter Votre exemple, quand ils considéreront qu'Erasmus, qu'ils appellent encore L'amour, et les Délices de la Grande Bretagne, a été l'ennemi déclaré de Luther, et de tous les Hérétiques qui sont venus après lui; qu'il n'a point eu d'autres sentiments que ceux de l'Eglise Catholique; et qu'il a toujours protesté, que ni la vie, ni la mort, ne le sépareroient jamais du sein de cette épouse de Jésus-Christ....

Here a little more guile comes in:

Il est vrai, Sire, que Votre Majesté n'a pas besoin d'être soutenue par les sentiments d'Erasmus, pour attirer ses sujets à suivre son exemple....

¹ *Twenty select Colloquies out of Erasmus Rotterdamus*... made English by Ro. L'Estrange, London, 1680.

² Cambridge University Library, Acton. d. 5. 216.

The book itself is dull and rambling, and is mainly a recital of the compliments paid to Erasmus by Popes and Cardinals rather than a proof of anything. Its interest for us lies in the fact that Erasmus's name was being used in 1688 by both parties in the struggle, and in the very clear idea it gives of the immense spiritual authority Erasmus still wielded. The author says that he is impelled to write by the love of the Church, and the desire to save so many souls, who are lost every day owing to their mistaken belief that Erasmus was a Lutheran! One feels he meant to exaggerate, but the assertion is interesting.

In the eighteenth century, until the very end, any polemical use of Erasmus's works lapsed in England. There are reprints of some of the devotional books; there are translations of the *Colloquies* to be used as school books,¹ and some of these had a good deal of success—one of them had fourteen editions in England and America, and another, by Nathan Bailey,² remains the standard edition of the *Colloquies* to this day. But otherwise we have to wait till the 'nineties before finding a reprint to our purpose.

It was not so in France; Erasmus had his full share in the ebullition of the period.

It began as early as 1711, with a new translation of the *Enchiridion*, by a grave person writing under the name of Claude du Bosc. He followed it up in 1713 by a translation of several other short writings of Erasmus,³ and on each occasion was careful to insist on the orthodoxy of Erasmus and to gain the approbation of a Doctor of the Sorbonne; and in 1714 a translation of the treatise on Christian Marriage was added, with a preface mentioning the increase in restlessness and crime that du Bosc noticed around him.

The defence of Erasmus in the preface to the *Enchiridion* fired a more famous writer, the Abbé Marsollier, to produce an *Apologie ou Justification d'Erasme*, which he published in 1713 at du Bosc's printers.⁴ Marsollier was a Canon of Uzès, and a prolific writer on history: he published among other things a life of St François de Sales, a history of the ministry of Cardinal Ximénez, and a history of the Inquisition. His idea in attempting a defence of Erasmus was evidently inspired by the desire to wrench the humanist away from the Protestants and especially from that hive of

¹ By John Clarke, 1720.

² London, Darby and Bettesworth, 1725.

³ *Du mépris du monde, et de la pureté de l'église chrétienne, avec un discours sur l'Enfant Jésus, et une lettre aux religieuses de Cambridge de l'Ordre de St François, qui contient un excellent Eloge de la Solitude*, Paris, Fr. Babuty, 1713.

⁴ François Babuty, rue St Jacques.

iniquity in Holland. He begins his preface with the good eighteenth-century notion that as individuals owe service to society, so society owes protection to the individual, and especially to the memory of a reputation; and he shows the delight of his generation in a nicely gilded pill:

Il scavoit ôter à la vérité tout ce qu'elle pouvoit avoir d'amer et de choquant. . Il ne la montrait, cette vérité, que par les endroits par où elle pouvoit plaire, instruire, convaincre, gagner les cœurs. Art merveilleux où peu de gens ont réussi.

So far, so good; but the candid Abbé was to call down on himself the violent reproaches of the Jesuits. Their *Journal de Trévoux* of June 1714 devotes a long article to the *Apologie*¹ First it gives a clear résumé of the arguments and then it launches upon a refutation, more in the nature of a diatribe than of a reasoned case. The Jesuits had able writers and this article is so direct and violent that it makes amusing reading. It states its object clearly—'démasquer les loups travestis en bergers'—and enlarges on the dangers of reading Erasmus, forbidden by its founder to the Company of Jesus. Erasmus, it continues, was a renegade who entered the world by apostasy and left it without calling in the consolations of the Church.

The interesting thing is that the Jesuit writer now regards Erasmus as *indifferent* to religion. The transformation has occurred. His tolerance is put down as a mixture of the desire for new things and timidity; but there is a clear reference to the influence exerted by him on the free-thinkers and rationalists:

Voilà tout le secret de la modération dont ses défenseurs veulent lui faire honneur; il n'a été ni Luthérien, ni Catholique, il a évité de faire une secte; il a pourtant donné commencement à une secte fort nombreuse, à la secte des Tolérants.

What can be said in favour of the *Docteur Tolérant*? His creed would suit anybody, even the Socinians. His personality is fluctuating and evasive, 'prêt à jouer toutes sortes de personnages, prêt à porter le déguisement jusqu'au pied des Autels, à combattre ce qu'il pensoit, à enseigner ce qu'il ne pensoit pas'. He was condemned by the Universities of Paris and Louvain; Kings and Popes were afraid of him. If he did edit the Fathers, it was after poisoning the source of truth with his bold remarks and satirical prefaces. The article ends with an eloquent tirade. What is to be looked for from Erasmus's works?

Le sens de l'Ecriture? Il l'a perverti par ses explications téméraires. La tradition? Il l'a obscurcie par les excès de sa critique. La foi? Il l'a trahie par ses ménagements. La piété? Il ne l'a pas connue, il ne l'a pas sentie; pour la sentir, pour l'inspirer, il faut la pratiquer; un Apostat, un excommunié, un médisant, qui n'épargnoit personne, un bouffon qui se jouait des choses les plus saintes; l'auteur des colloques, de cette satire impie, qui, au jugement des plus graves défenseurs de la foi, a fait plus de mal

¹ *Journal de Trévoux*, 1714, Jun, pp. 935, 954, etc.

à l'église que les écrits emportés de Luther; un fourbe, un homme indifférent pour la religion, a-t-il pratiqué la piété? Non sans doute....

The debate went on for years; a *Critique de l'Apologie* written in 1715 had an edition in 1719, and in 1723 another violent attack on Erasmus appeared in the *Journal de Trévoux*.¹ But outside the ecclesiastical circles another Erasmus was gaining much popularity during this time; the merry author of light literature with a sting in its tail. The colloquy translated under the title of 'La femme mécontente de son mari' had a run of editions,² and this was the great period of the *Praise of Folly*.

The life history of the eighteenth-century translators of the *Praise of Folly* would be a prolific subject in itself.³

The first translation, and one which kept its popularity for years and ran into eighteen editions, was by a somewhat disreputable character, Nicolas Gueudeville. He was one of those whom the Jesuit Father of the *Journal de Trévoux* describes as following their writings very precipitately into Holland. The son of a Rouen doctor, he began as a Benedictine famed for his sermons. The Order found the sermons too original and Gueudeville found the Order too trammelling; he ran away to Holland, turned Protestant, and married, round about 1690. From that time he made a living by teaching and writing, founded a journal directed against the French Government and called *L'Esprit des Cours de l'Europe*, and produced any amount of pot-boilers, many of them translations, such as his versions of the *Utopia*, and of Plautus. He had a leaning for the comic, and about 1720 he translated the *Colloquies*. His version of the *Praise of Folly* was not very accurate but it was racy, and it was taken up by other people and remodelled, to be republished still under his name. The volumes at first had Holbein's woodcuts, but in 1751 they were replaced by lovely engravings by Eissen in a sumptuous *édition de luxe*. Of his preface more anon.

A second translation, by a certain de la Veaux, was published in 1780 to accompany the Latin edition which came out in that year at the same printer's in Bâle. This may have been meant for a Swiss public; in any case a third translator, Jean-Jacques de Barrett, published a new translation in Paris in 1789. It is a curious date for a new edition of the *Praise of Folly*, and Barrett may have been an interesting character. He came of English extraction, but remotely, and was born at Condom in 1717. He was a professor of Latin, and translated Cicero, Ovid, Virgil, Machiavelli and Tacitus. At one time he was inspector general of the École

¹ *Journal de Trévoux*, 1723, Mars, p. 507.

² 1707, 1708, 1729.

³ See *Bibliotheca Erasmana*, vol. vii.

Militaire, and died in Paris in August 1792, eight days after the sack of the Tuileries. Whether he was a victim of what is now described as 'les événements' I have no evidence to decide.

From these versions, at any rate from those of Gueudeville and Barrett, one might attempt to deduce the reasons for this great vogue. It is obvious that a book like the *Praise of Folly* would be exactly to the taste of the eighteenth century, both for its lightness of humour, for its skill in masking serious questions with a veil of fun, and for its tilting at all the self-important elements in society. Gueudeville praises Erasmus for being a practical man:

Le principal but de son assiduité à l'étude étoit de réfléchir sur les mœurs. Il seroit bien à souhaiter, que les Savans imitassent ce grand modèle; au lieu de ces hautes spéculations qui, presque toujours, sont creuses et stériles, ils nous enseigneroient le vrai usage de la Raison, et ils pourroient profiter les premiers de leur leçon.

They saw in Erasmus a rationalist and a pioneer of anti-clericalism. Barrett, in his preface of 1789, sees a warning to the great of the earth, a recall to their responsibilities, in the *Praise of Folly*. The speech of Folly shows the great their weaknesses and brings them to a sense of their position:

Elle vante le bonheur dont elle les fait jouir, en leur faisant oublier leurs devoirs qui leur donnoient trop de souci. Mais tout ce qu'elle dit, tend à leur rappeler le souvenir de ces devoirs mêmes, à leur en faire sentir l'importance, à secouer leurs âmes engourdies, et à leur donner la leçon des remords.

It is surely not imagination to hear in those words the tone of the times.

The eighteenth century had its own reasons for appreciating the *Praise of Folly*: but it is a matter of speculation whether this appreciation went deeper than the surface value. Actually, this book is one of the very few in which Erasmus allows himself to describe the irrational sides of human life. Folly, the speaker, is as Protean as Erasmus himself: she describes the effect she has on human affairs, and how she makes the wheels of the world go round, and at one moment she identifies herself with stupidity or weakness, with pride in little things, with pleasure that makes life liveable; at another she seems to be the force of Nature, without which there would be no love-making or begetting of children; at another she seems to express Erasmus himself as she praises humble simplicity in religious thought and laughs at quiddities and quoddities; and at the end of the book she has a passage on the ecstasy of the saints and the mystic life which makes it seem that she is identified with the super-rational activities of the soul. It is the recognition of mysticism that makes the book so strange in the hands of Erasmus; and if the reader, shocked, calls him to order by saying 'But it's a crime to call mysticism

folly!' the answer comes pat, 'But it's only Folly herself who says so'. In fact Erasmus makes his position entirely safe, and the fact that such an assertion is put into the mouth of Folly can be made to prove either of two possibilities that mysticism existed for Erasmus and Folly is here his mouthpiece, or that mysticism to him was founded on rational thinking and it is Folly to call it super-rational.

However, enough of the book expresses his own views, as for instance in the satire of scholastic philosophy, to make it likely that Folly can be taken here too as his messenger; and if so, he is standing up on the one hand for common sense as against intellectual juggling, and on the other hand expressing a belief in the direct apprehension of Truth through faith. The eighteenth-century readers must have accepted the one and rejected the other. When Folly describes herself as the playful, robust force which gives zest to physical life, they probably applauded her more than Erasmus meant them to, but when she pointed out how much of the Christian religion was founded on lack of logic, how unreasonable it is to do good to one's enemies or give away all one's goods to the poor, and how far from common sense the religious enthusiast can be—here, where Folly is speaking in her own person and not in Erasmus's, the eighteenth century may well have taken him as a pioneer of anti-Christian as well as anti-clerical feeling.

The last phase of this story concerns a determined effort made at the end of the eighteenth and at the beginning of the nineteenth century to propagate Erasmus's pacifism. This is a domain in which we have seen Erasmus figuring in our own day, but actually his essay on war in the *Adagia* made a very deep impression when it was first published and has stuck in the public mind ever since. It had a personal inspiration; it ends with the account of the life of Alexander Stewart, the natural son of James IV who fell with his father at Flodden. He was Erasmus's pupil and toured Italy with him at the age of sixteen, already at that time Archbishop of St Andrews, a Renaissance prelate in embryo. His letters to his father show him to have been imperious and ambitious, pushing his servants' interests and founding colleges in humanist style. Erasmus had only good memories of him, of his interest in learning, his graceful manners and grave conversation and delight in music after dinner. The bitterness Erasmus always felt about war took on a personal note when he described the loss of this boy of twenty.

The translation which formed the basis of the nineteenth-century pacifist series was published in 1794 under the title of 'Antipolemus;

or the Plea of Reason, Religion and Humanity against War'. It was reprinted eleven times in English and eight in French, from 1817 onwards, first as a tract published by the Society for the Promotion of Permanent and Universal Peace, then by the Society of Friends. The French versions are translated from the English, and are evidently an appeal to a French public from an English source.

It was not the only time that Erasmus had come into connexion with the strained relations existing between England and France. Robert Bland, a doctor who translated many of the *Adagia* in 1814, had much to say on the question of possible peace with France:

From the present position of affairs it may be expected that the countries where they [modern languages] are spoken will soon be opened to us; and though the mass of the people in one of those countries have shown themselves, in the course of the dreadful revolution that has taken place there, to be so frivolous, insignificant and mischievous as to promise little advantage from mixing too intimately with them, yet there are not wanting a sufficient number of intelligent people among them to make a communication desirable. It may be hoped also that the misery they have for so many years suffered, may have the effect of producing an alteration in their character. No symptom of such a change, it should be observed, has yet appeared, notwithstanding the losses their country has sustained, and the degradation of their ruler; a circumstance which should be well noted here, and prove a caution to our people from flocking over to that country, should the door be again, for a short time, opened, as they did on a former occasion, to their own destruction and to the disgrace of our national character.¹

But the *Antipolemus* is truly pacifist, so much so that the gap in publication between 1794 and 1817 was inevitable. Between 1817 and 1850 there was evidently a determined effort to put its ideas over.²

The original *Antipolemus* is a stirring document. The difficulty about it is to know what to quote. There is a mighty preface, bringing Erasmus well up to date, which starts with a panegyric of the humanist

It pleases Almighty God to raise up, from time to time, men of extraordinary abilities, who, in the dark night of ignorance and prejudice, shine like the nocturnal lamp of Heaven, with solitary but serene lustre. Such was Erasmus; a name, at the mention of which, all that is great and good, and learned and Free, feels a sentiment of cordial respect, and rises to pay him a voluntary obeisance.

The salient theme is that Erasmus gained for humanity not only ecclesiastical freedom, but civil freedom too:

Liberty acknowledges him as one of her noblest assertors. Had he not appeared and fought on the side of humanity, with the spear of truth and the lash of ridicule, Europe, instead of enjoying or contending for freedom at this hour, might perhaps have been still sunk in the dead repose of servitude, or galled with the iron of civil tyrants, allied, for mutual aid, in a villainous confederacy, with the despotism of ecclesiastics. Force and fraud, availing themselves of the superstitious fears of ignorance, had united against the People, conspired against the majority of men, and dealt their curses through the land without mercy or controul. Then rose Erasmus....

¹ Robert Bland, M.D., F.S.A., *Proverbs chiefly taken from the Adages of Erasmus* London, 1814.

² But there was also a translation of the *Querela Pacis*, published in 1802.

And so here is a new view of Erasmus, who plainly appears as a predecessor of Tom Paine. 'Erasmus demands attention', says the translator, even if he has not *yet* succeeded in abolishing war as he abolished ecclesiastical tyranny. There is a French influence evident in the way in which the translator quotes La Bruyère and Bayle in defence of Erasmus and his pacifism, and one very interesting application of his theories is in his comments on the American war, in which he is decidedly critical of British methods. There is also a very forceful passage against the use of the name of religion in any but a purely defensive war, where the author is evidently aiming at the indignation roused in England by the principles of the Revolution.

If it be true [he says] that Infidelity is increasing, if a great nation be indeed throwing aside Christianity, instead of the superstition that has disgraced it; it is time that those who believe in Christianity and are convinced that it is beneficial to the world, show mankind its most alluring graces, its merciful benignant effects, its utter abhorrence of war, its favourable influence on the arts of peace, and on all that contributes to the solid comfort of human life.

All this is purely eighteenth century in its belief in progress, its assertion that man is awakening from the slumber of childish superstitions, becoming his rational self. Erasmus stands at the head of those writers who have attempted this emancipation.

With as much wit and comprehension of mind as Voltaire and Rousseau, he has the advantage of them in two points, in sound learning and in religion. . . . Let ministers of state, who, by the way, are always cried up as paragons of ability, wonders of the world, for the time being, let under-secretaries, commissioners, commissaries, contractors, clerks, and borough-jobbers, the warm patrons of all wars; let these men prove themselves superior in intellect, learning, piety and humanity, to Erasmus, and I give up the cause.

But the cause is safe in the hands of Erasmus,

for he has established it on the rock Truth. It stands on the same base with the Christian religion. . . . Let it be remembered that the reformation of religion was more unlikely in the twelfth century than the abolition of war in the eighteenth.

This is actually his hope, as my last extract will show:

The total abolition of war, and the establishment of perpetual and universal peace, appear to me to be of more consequence than anything ever achieved or even attempted, by mere mortal man, since the Creation. The goodness of the cause is certain, though its success, for a time, doubtful. Yet I will not fear. I have chosen ground, solid as the everlasting hills, and firm as the very firmament of Heaven. I have planted an acorn; the timber and the shade are reserved for posterity.

To sum up: we have here undeniable evidence that Erasmus's name and writings were used throughout the three centuries following his death to further a variety of schemes. We have seen him in the hands of the Protestant reformers, both in France and England; we have seen him illustrating the Jansenist view of fallen man and helping to ridicule the

Précieuses; in the seventeenth century, we have seen him extricating L'Estrange from suspicion as a Popish plotter and being used to recall England to Rome; in the eighteenth century, he has become the champion of tolerance, of rationalism, even of incredulity, and the pioneer of civil equality and freedom; in the nineteenth century, he is the friend of the pro-Revolutionary party in England and the apostle of peace. One wonders if there are other rôles reserved to him in the future. Meanwhile can any conclusions be drawn from this changing of costume?

The evolution sketched by these translations may perhaps help to explain the perpetual charm of Erasmus. The most striking feature of this history is the growing secularity and the growing internationalism of the interest represented. The translations illustrate a real change of emphasis as regards the personality of the subject; from attempts to enlist Erasmus as a partisan, there seems to be a perpetual widening of the issue. Once more they show how Erasmus stood on the threshold of the sixteenth century as a representative of the future, foretelling and directing some of the main trends of post-Renaissance society. In three specific ways this appears to be the case.

In the first place, the translations and the comments upon them show how the popular conception of Erasmus developed, to make him appear as the father of modern rationalism. He began as the advocate of apostolic simplicity, a rebel against the medieval use of logic, an enemy of abstract argument and unprovable assertions, and he became not only the immediate inspirer of Montaigne, but the patron claimed by Bayle. The sceptics only took over one side of his thought, the destructive side, aimed at the abolition of purely abstract reasoning, the scholastic house of cards. It was the overthrow of reason in one sense, the end of the reign of logic, while in another sense reason remained victorious in the field, asserting the rights of man as against traditional views and sophistries.

Then, by his hatred of any division between the intellectual and moral life, Erasmus paved the way for a lay morality. This would have been against his own heart if he could have foreseen its results, but the fact that he begged for tolerance, charity, an upright life, in the name of reason as well as in the name of Christ, made him the apostle of the flock outside the fold as much as of that within. He has seemed to individuals in all parties, ever since, to have solved the problem of caste and sect, and to have leapt over the wall into a freer world, where there is more to unite men than to divide them. If it be true, despite present events, that Europe has been painfully drawing towards a real fusion, Erasmus could hardly avoid standing for the final hope: the mutual understanding

between peoples. He represents the only virtues by which that understanding could come about: the sincere recognition by all of certain common standards, and the tolerance which could refuse to make anything but the gravest issues a reason for conflict. And unlike many men of tolerance, he invited confidence because his tolerant attitude was founded on positive and not on negative assertions; because it was the result of a creed and self-identification with an unimpeachable morality. In fact, he achieved the miracle of having a positive, affirmative belief which did not seek to destroy or belittle others, and which sought to unite rather than to divide. Hence his appearance as the patron saint of pacifism.

Finally, there may well be a reason for Erasmus's popularity, which is in no way topical, but permanent. He brought about in himself the balance for which mankind is continually seeking. Oscillating as it does between the consciousness of its power and the sense of its helplessness, it needs two opposite strains in moral life: the striving towards an ever-developing ideal, and that practical activity which brings a rest from intellectual effort and the overwhelming claims of science. Erasmus supplied both. On the one hand he saw a clear way to good through the conscious effort of man, and had all the Renaissance faith in judgement and goodwill. On the other he persistently opposed useless speculation, and warned reason away from too arrogantly lording it in the realms of action and faith. Arguments are not deeds, knowing is not being; Christ is not in clever sophistry but in the reality of the heart which produces the good life:

Think, in fact, that Christ is no empty word, but just these things, charity, simplicity, patience, purity, in a word, whatever he himself taught.

These words are from the *Enchiridion*, which unites this modest attitude of the practical man with that unbounded faith in truth, which may well be of use to us now:

Be sure that whatever you meet with which is true, belongs to Christ. Don't let yourself be troubled, if you see the greater part of the world living as if heaven and hell were mere empty stories, designed to attract or terrify children. You who believe, go on without haste. If the whole world were to go mad to the last man, the elements to change character, the angels themselves to turn traitor, still Truth could not lie.

MARGARET MANN PHILLIPS.

CAMBRIDGE.

THE SECOND PART OF 'TAMBURLAINE THE GREAT'

CRITICISM has been harsh to the second of Marlowe's plays on the career of Tamburlaine. It is usually regarded as an inferior sequel to the first part, repeating its theme with a different ending. Some critics have seen in it a study of degeneration, a picture of the great adventurer of the first part growing more bloodthirsty, cruel and boastful, until, at the height of his triumphs, he is cut off. Miss Ellis-Fermor, in her edition of both parts, feels that the second is very different from the first and ascribes this difference to a change in Marlowe's feeling towards his hero; but she feels that the result of this change is boredom with his theme and imaginative poverty in handling it. 'Of the events and episodes available to Marlowe when he wrote the first part of *Tamburlaine*,' she writes, 'very few had been omitted. There was, consequently, little left of the original legend when a second part was to be written. He had, beyond doubt, a clear conception of the development the chief character should suffer, and this differed so far from the conception of the first part as to endanger the effectiveness of a play written on similar lines. . . . In this situation, then, with his sources for the life already drained and his sympathies no longer strongly enough engaged to stimulate his imagination to constructive plotting, he seems to have been driven to eke out his material by introducing irrelevant episodes, some of which he weaves in skilfully, others of which are, and look like, padding. . . . The first part alone reveals Marlowe's mind at work on a characteristic structure; much of the second, though flashes of power and passages of thought as clear as anything in the earlier part occur at intervals throughout, is, by comparison, journeyman work. The form of the whole is no longer an inevitable expression of an underlying idea.'¹

It is the argument of this article that the second part of *Tamburlaine* has been misjudged and that while it is true that Marlowe's sympathies have changed since he wrote the first part, it is not true that this makes his play ineffective, since the change of sympathies has meant a change of theme, and the change of theme has, in turn, necessitated a change of structure. The second part of *Tamburlaine* is not a mere continuation of the first; it is different in intention and plan. The subsidiary episodes, which seem irrelevant padding if we regard the play as a rewriting of the

¹ *Tamburlaine the Great*, edited by U. M. Ellis-Fermor, London, 1930, pp. 41 and 46. All quotations from *Tamburlaine* are taken from this edition.

first part with a different ending, are relevant when we recognize the theme and the play's structure. It cannot be claimed that the second part of *Tamburlaine* is a great play, but it can be claimed that it is better than it is commonly supposed to be, and that it shows in some degree the Shakespearian method of plotting, in which episodes and sub-plots are linked to the main plot by idea, rather than the primitive structure of *Tamburlaine, Part I*, or *Dr Faustus*. In its conception, it looks forward to *Dr Faustus*, rather than backwards to *Part I*, though it makes, of course, continual reference to the first part and shows indeed many ironic contrasts with it.

The theme of the first part of *Tamburlaine* is the power and splendour of the human will, which bears down all opposition and by its own native force achieves its desires. Tamburlaine is shown to us in the double rôle of warrior and lover. In both he is irresistible and the play reaches its climax in his conquest of Zenocrate's father, the Soldan, and the crowning of Zenocrate as Queen and Empress of the kingdoms he has conquered. The structure of the play is extremely simple and could be plotted as a single rising line on a graph; there are no setbacks. The world into which Tamburlaine, the unknown Scythian shepherd, bursts like a kind of portent is decadent, divided and torn by petty strife. Little dignity or grandeur is given to his opponents and, as Miss Ellis-Fermor justly remarks, the tragic pity, voiced by Zenocrate, for 'the Turk and his great emperess' is allowed only slight scope. Opposition appears to melt away at Tamburlaine's mere appearance. Theridamas, sent with an army against him, is won over by his presence and comes over to his side without a battle; Cosroe, who dethrones his brother and plans to use Tamburlaine for his own purposes, is easily overthrown. In love the path is equally straight. Zenocrate, betrothed to the Prince of Arabia, when captured by Tamburlaine, makes no defiance. We are not even shown a wooing; at their second meeting, she is already in love with him and yields without a show of resistance, seeming to range herself on his side, as the others do, by instinct.

The theme of the second part is very different. Man's desires and aspirations may be limitless, but their fulfilment is limited by forces outside the control of the will. There are certain facts, of which death is the most obvious, which no aspiration and no force of soul can conquer. There is a sort of stubbornness in the stuff of experience which frustrates and resists the human will. The world is not the plaything of the ambitious mind. There are even hints in the play that there is an order in the world, of which men's minds are a part, and that man acts against this

order at his peril. This theme of the clash between man's desires and his experience demands a more complex structure for its expression than was demanded by the theme of the triumphant human will in the first part. If the first part can be plotted as a steadily rising line, the second can be thought of as two lines, the line of Tamburlaine and that of his enemies. Neither rises or falls steadily, but on the whole it can be said that the forces opposing Tamburlaine grow in strength during the first half of the play and reach their zenith in the third act, and that after this we see the power of Tamburlaine reasserting itself, until, at the moment of his greatest triumph, he is struck down by death. But a graph of two lines does not really express the play's structure, since it leaves unrepresented the force that in the end destroys the hero. This force (it can be called Necessity or God, according to one's interpretation of Marlowe's religious thought) appears from time to time in the body of the play and in the end reduces the contest between Tamburlaine and his foes to an episode in the world's pattern; it provides a kind of ground swell to the whole play. The truth of this analysis can only be brought out by a detailed examination of the plot.

The second part, like the first, does not open with the hero, but with his opponents; but, whereas in the first part they are shown as despicable, in the second they are dignified and worthy of respect. At the beginning of the first part we saw the kingdom of Persia fallen into the hands of a fool, whose brother was plotting with the aid of a faction at the court to dethrone him. In the second part we find the Turkish kings deciding upon a truce with the Christians, in order to secure their rear against attack while they fight with Tamburlaine. That is to say, the first part showed us a world of disunity and strife, which fell an easy prey to Tamburlaine's ambition, while the second shows us a world aware of the menace of Tamburlaine and organizing itself to oppose him. By the second scene of the first act the truce has been made and Orcanes with his allies is prepared for Tamburlaine's attack. In the third scene we meet Callapine, the captive son of Bajazeth, who, by promises and bribes, wins over his gaoler, Almeda, to betray his trust and assist in an escape. This scene, in which a servant of Tamburlaine's is won over from him by the lure of money and glory, would be inconceivable in the first part. There all the attraction and the lures are on Tamburlaine's side; he is a kind of magnet, attracting the ambitious towards him. The treachery of his servant at the opening of the second part suggests that we have no longer to do with the conquering demi-god of the first part; the Tamburlaine spell is not working. In the next scene Tamburlaine himself appears

and the same feeling is just hinted at. For all his power of will, he is unable to mould his sons as he pleases. He is distressed by their unwarlike appearance, satisfied by the bloodthirsty remarks of two of them, but baffled by the unabashed cowardice of Calyphas. Miss Ellis-Fermor's notes to this scene speak of 'that hint of frustration and anxiety which grows more definite as this part of the play progresses'. But both the scene of Callapine's escape and that of Calyphas's unnatural pacificism give only hints and the old Tamburlaine soon reasserts himself. His companions, Theridamas, Techelles and Usumcasane, enter with news of conquering campaigns and of great armies come to fight on his side. The first act ends with Tamburlaine apparently all-powerful, banqueting in triumph among his subject kings.

The second act opens with a setback for the enemies of Tamburlaine. The Christian kings decide to break their truce with the Turks, on the ground that faith need not be kept with infidels. When the news of this treachery is brought to Orcanes, he, an unbeliever, makes the famous appeal to the Christ whom the Christians worship, to show his Godhead by punishing the perjury of his servants. Marlowe could not resist the opportunity of underlining the contrast between the faith of Christians and their works, but the real meaning of the episode lies in the lines in which Marlowe, through the mouth of Orcanes, expresses his belief that the God who 'everywhere fills every continent with strange infusion of his sacred vigour' is a God of purity as well as of power, and that he punishes the sins of men. Orcanes's appeal to Christ is answered; the Christians flee in discomfiture, acknowledging their fate is just. The opponents of Tamburlaine, weakened at the beginning of the act, end in a stronger position through having surmounted the trial, and the whole moral feeling of the episode tells against the arrogance of Tamburlaine. The action passes at once and without warning to the deathbed of Zenocrate and here the moral is too clear to need any pointing; it is given with sad brevity by the watching Theridamas:

Ah, good my lord, be patient! she is dead,
And all this raging cannot make her live.

The third act opens with a scene which is obviously intended to parallel Act 1, scene 6. There, Tamburlaine, having summoned his subject kings, assessed his forces for the coming campaign: here, Callapine, having been crowned with his father's crown Emperor of Turkey, is told by his tributary kings what strength they can bring for the coming struggle with Tamburlaine. This scene shows Callapine at the peak of his power; the confederation against Tamburlaine is at its height. By contrast,

Tamburlaine in the next scene is at his most dejected, celebrating the death of Zenocrate by the futile and savage burning of a town. Having lost his wife, he turns to his sons for consolation, only to find himself baffled by the weakness of Calyphas. His attention is distracted by the other two, who show a dutiful indifference to pain, but a hint is given here of another of those forces which hamper us in the execution of our ambitions, the resistance of other wills, which refuse to accept the parts we assign to them.

This theme is developed in a subsidiary episode, which has usually been regarded as mere padding, that of Theridamas and Olympia, the Captain's wife. In reading this episode, one recalls the parallel situation of the first part, when Zenocrate, captured as a prize of war, also charms her conqueror by her beauty. There the conqueror was as successful in love as in war and his captive responded to his passion before he spoke of it. Theridamas, the hero of this episode, is associated in our minds with Tamburlaine, as his closest friend and most loyal follower; his fortunes have followed those of his master. The rebuff he suffers here at the hands of Olympia, who prefers death to his love, and eludes him finally, when he seems to have absolute power over her, by a clever ruse, seems to reflect back on Tamburlaine himself.

The death of Olympia follows immediately upon the murder of Calyphas, which is itself an example of failure coming on the heels of success. Act 3 ends with a scolding match between Tamburlaine and the Turkish kings and in Act 4, scene 1 Tamburlaine wins his first great victory over Orcanes and his allies; but the moment of triumph is spoilt by the cowardice of Calyphas and he celebrates his victory by the murder of his son, whom he can kill, but cannot force to obey him. It is possible that Marlowe had some sympathy with the effeminate Calyphas (he certainly provides him with some good ironic comment on his father); but one must be careful not to read a modern criticism of the value of military exploits into what may have seemed to the Elizabethans obvious wrong-headedness, nor must one overestimate the value of the silence with which he dies. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that though the bystanders plead for his life, Calyphas himself says nothing. This may be a deliberate touch, the last defiance of the weakling, or it may be that Marlowe forgot the victim in his interest in the executioner; or, perhaps, his father's reference to his 'fainting soul' is to be taken literally. But the whole treatment of Calyphas suggests something more subtle than the traditional coward; his distaste for war and his refusal to find his father impressive are positive rather than negative attitudes, and his

silent death may be due partly to his realization of his father's implacability and partly to his desire to infuriate him by not cowering. In the general development of the play, the two episodes of Olympia and Calyphas taken together prepare us for the dénouement; they both show the limitations of human power, here thwarted by other human wills. Occurring as they do, at the moment of Tamburlaine's first military success in this play, they hint at the hollowness of such triumphs; and, in this context, the mad bombast of Tamburlaine, which, in the last scene of the fourth act, culminates in the yoking of the conquered kings to his chariot, is seen for what it is: an impious assertion of human pride, ludicrous in its excess, and by its exaggeration revealing the palpable falseness of his claim to absolute power.

Throughout the fifth act the power of Tamburlaine grows and that of his foes declines. The Governor of Babylon makes a show of resistance, but yields to pressure: the conquered kings have a moment of revolt, but are soon 'bridled'. Tamburlaine, defying Mahomet, and with him conventional religious observances, claims that he is the great servant and instrument of the only true God.

There is a God, full of revenging wrath,
From whom the thunder and the lightning breaks,
Whose scourge I am, and him will I obey.

It is at the height of his power that Tamburlaine is struck down. Even when dying he can, by his mere presence, put the army of Callapine to flight; but his last and greatest victory is only the prelude to death. Through the last half of the play, as his power has grown, so have the warnings of fate, mere hints in the first act, grown louder. Now sickness proves him a man who 'was termed the terror of the world'. In words gentler and graver than one would expect, and which are often overlooked, Tamburlaine, in his dying admonition to his heir, himself moralizes his end:

Nor bar thy mind that magnanimity
That nobly must admit necessity.

It is by necessity that 'Tamburlaine the scourge of God must die.'

It cannot be claimed that the execution of *Tamburlaine, Part 2* is equal to the conception, but the play contains less irrelevance than is usually imagined, and it is an interesting early attempt at a more complicated tragic pattern than the first part or *Dr Faustus* can show. Its tragic pattern is not unlike that of *Sejanus*, where we are shown the fortunes of Sejanus and the group opposed to him, and Tiberius at Capreae operating as a kind of Fate. In *Sejanus* also the catastrophe comes with great

suddenness, after an apparent triumph, and there is the same wavering movement in the fortunes of Sejanus and his enemies as in those of Tamburlaine and Callapine. The basis of the pattern in *Tamburlaine, Part 2* is the struggle of Tamburlaine and Callapine, but into this conflict of military and political power is woven the theme of necessity, a necessity which Marlowe tries to moralize. It is moralized early in the play by the answer which the prayer of the good heathen Orcanes receives, and, in the later half, by the mad pride of Tamburlaine, which gives his death the quality of a punishment. The first part of *Tamburlaine* glorifies the human will: the second displays its inevitable limits. It is a first handling of the theme of *Dr Faustus*—a weaker handling, because Tamburlaine's ambitions are cruder than those of Faustus, and because there is little feeling in *Tamburlaine, Part 2* for the paradoxes that make up the tragedy of the later play. Faustus, aiming at being more than man, becomes less, for he cuts himself off from the common mercies of God; desiring all knowledge, he finds the great secret barred from him, for he may learn nothing 'that is against our kingdom'; desiring all power, he finds himself the slave of Mephistopheles, who, he had thought, was to be his servant. *Dr Faustus*, in spite of its mutilated state, expresses clearly the great tragic idea of the essential vanity of desires which refuse to take into account the limitations of humanity. The theme of *Tamburlaine, Part 2* is less profoundly tragic than this, and Marlowe shows little sense that the goods which Tamburlaine pursues are in the end themselves unsatisfying. The play proclaims only the idea of necessity, which the magnanimous mind must 'nobly admit', and its moral is the simple medieval one of the inevitability of death. But the arrival of that final check to Tamburlaine's fantasies of omnipotence is more carefully prepared for than is usually admitted and the earlier episodes of the play, sometimes judged to be mere padding, are mainly anticipations of the final catastrophe and variations on the underlying theme.

HELEN L. GARDNER.

OXFORD.

NOTES ON EARLY STUART STAGE HISTORY.

THE following Notes have been put together in the rough and incomplete form inevitable under present conditions. They may, however, serve to make information available for the use of scholars without further delay. They are mainly concerned with the Red Bull, but include miscellaneous notes also.

I. BIOGRAPHICAL NOTES

ADSON, John. Citizen and Musician of London, of Red Cross Street, St Giles-without-Cripplegate, age 38 on 1 December 1623. Married Jane Balls (b. *ca.* 1594), sister of Richard Balls, *q.v.*¹

ALBONE, Thomas. A three-quarter sharer in the Red Bull Company. Died *ca.* 1618, when no payment was made to his executors in respect of his share.²

ALLEN, John, of Clerkenwell, Middlesex, yeoman, servant to the Earl of Derby, age 45 on 22 June 1589.³

ATTREE, John, of St Giles-without-Cripplegate, gent., age 44 in Michaelmas Term 1614.⁴ Part landlord of the Red Bull Theatre in 1618. Died before 1623.² Signs *John Attree*.

BALLS, Francis. Apparently not the son of Richard Balls, *q.v.*^{5,6}

BALLS, Richard. One of the King's musicians, engaged in teaching boys to play instruments for the King's service, at wage of £40 *p.a.* Also a musician or wait of the City of London, at £40 *p.a.* Also engaged as musician to play at the Blackfriars Theatre. Total income, including fees from private pupils, £150–200 *p.a.* Lived, 1621–23 before his death late in 1623, with his mistress Jane Thomas and her maid, with his brother-in-law Adson, *q.v.*, having deserted his wife Elizabeth, by whom he had no children, *ca.* 1612.⁶

BASKERVILE, Francis. Son of James and Susan Baskerville, *q.v.* Born after 1613, died in Michaelmas 1616.⁷

BASKERVILE, James. Married Susan Greene bigamously in June 1613. Bought share of profits in Red Bull in June 1615. Fled to Ireland, to avoid charge of bigamy, in Lent 1617.⁷

BASKERVILE, Susan. See 'Mr and Mrs Browne of The Boar's Head', in *Life and Letters Today*, Winter 1936. In addition, bought half of $\frac{1}{24}$ share in the Fortune Theatre, which she held from before 1640 to her death in 1648.⁸

¹ C 24/502.

² C 24/500 and 501.

³ C 24/201. Cf. Chambers, II, 299.

⁴ C 24/410/101.

⁵ See Bentley, II, 354–5.

⁶ C 24/502.

⁷ C 24/500 and 501.

⁸ C 5/381/95, C 5/399/81, C 7/101/132.

- BASSE, Thomas, of St James's, Clerkenwell, age 36 on 10 September 1623. Entered Queen Anne's company early in June 1617, and promised Heywood to sign the covenant of 3 June 1617 but failed to do so, refusing inducement of 40s. offered by the Baskerviles. Signs *Thomas Basse*, coarsely, in Secretary hand.¹
- BAXTER, Richard, of St James's, Clerkenwell, age 30 on 8 August 1623 (confirmed by deposition in later suit, age 72 on 31 May 1665).² Joined the company *ca.* 1609, probably as an apprentice. Subsequently hired man at 10s. per week, and became a sharer in 1623. Signs *Richard Baxter*, neatly, the signatures of 1623 and 1665 confirming identity.^{1,3}
- BEESTON, Christopher, alias Hutchinson, of St Giles-in-the-Fields, age 43 on 15 October 1623. Managed the company after the death of Greene. Accepted 40s. from Susan Baskerville to forward the agreement. Signed the covenant of 1617 and entered into a bond for £63, also for £10 to assure £5. 16s. 8d. which sum he paid duly. Signs *C. Beeston*, practised Secretary hand with Greek ϵ .¹
- BOURMAN, Robert. Musician to the King. Pupil of R. Balls.⁴
- BROWNE, Gertrude. Wife of Richard Browne of St James's, Clerkenwell, Cowper, age 60 on 18 November 1623. An intimate of the company since 1615. Was Browne a handy man at the theatre and occasional extra, as 'stage-keeper'? A 'cowper' would be useful in many ways. Signs, poorly, *Gartrite Broue*.⁵
- BROWNE, Robert. See 'Mr and Mrs Browne of the Boar's Head', in *Life and Letters Today*, Winter 1936; in which article it is indicated that there is a serious confusion between the Robert Browne who toured Germany in 1594-9 and Robert Browne the owner of the Boar's Head Theatre and leader of Worcester-Queen Anne's Men, who married Susan — in 1594, having lost his first wife, with their children, in the plague of 1593.⁶ There is no doubt whatever that the widow of 'Browne of the Boar's Head' married Thomas Greene.⁷
- CLARKE, Roger, of Golden Lane, St Giles, age 24 on 14 October 1623. Became hired man to the Red Bull company in 1621, at wages of 6s. per week, but was paid as little as 2s. 6d. per week. Has known Ellis Worth since 1611 and Blaney longer. Signs, illiterately, *Rogar Clarke*. He cannot be identified with any other known Clarke.⁵

¹ C 24/500 and 501.

² Reference missing. He was then 'of St Leonard's, Shoreditch, gent.'

³ See Bentley, II, 361.

⁴ C 24/502.

⁵ C 24/500 and 501; Bentley, II, 391.

⁶ C 24/304, with allied Decrees, etc.; Star Chamber 5, 74/3.

⁷ Chambers, II, 304.

COATES, Abraham, 'one of the Princes highnes Musicians', age 19 on 1 December 1623, a pupil of Richard Balls, *q.v.* Signs *Abraham Coates*, in a fair Italian hand.¹

CUMBER, John. Died Whitsuntide 1623.²

DREWE, Thomas, of Tower Street, All Hallows', Barking, free of the Fishmongers, age 37 on 18 November 1623. Joined Queen Anne's Men in 1612, after the death of George Pulham, *q.v.*, signed the covenant, and left the company at Christmas 1618. Signs *Thomas Drewe*, in a flourished, awkward Italian hand.²

DUKE, John. Leader of Worcester's Men in 1600. Entered into bonds, with five others, to Browne to act only at the Boar's Head, in 1600. Sued Browne for freedom from bonds in 1600. Entered into bonds to Langley to pay £3 weekly later in 1600.³

HEYWOOD, Thomas, of St James's, Clerkenwell, age 49 on 3 October 1623, and 50 years 'or neare vpon' on 3 October 1623. Left Admiral's Men to join Worcester's Men, after 25 March 1600, at the Boar's Head. Entered into bonds with Robert Browne to play only at the Boar's Head in 1600, and later in the year to pay £3 weekly to Francis Langley. With Duke, sued Browne for freedom from bonds, and lost his case, with £1. 6s. 8d. costs. Went with Worcester's Men to the Rose in 1601. A full sharer in the company, but received no payment for his share on leaving. Has known Worth and Blaney since 1607, and Susan Browne-Greene-Baskerville since 1598. Signed the covenant. Entered into bonds for £63, and for £10, but did not pay the £5. 16s. 8d. agreed. Signs *Thomas Heywood*, in a rough Italian hand (for facsimile see Supplement to *Literary Autographs*).^{2, 3}

HOLLAND, Aaron, of St James's, Clerkenwell, age 67 on 3 February 1622/3.⁴ Son of Robert Holland of Bletchington, Oxfordshire, grandson of Richard Holland of 'Hampton poyle'. There was one sister, Johan, who married John Johnson of Hampton. His father died when he was three years of age, intestate. Aaron is described in 1592 as 'of Gray's Inn Lane, Middlesex, tailor'. Before 6 November 1623 sold his share in the profits of the Red Bull and his lease of the land and building and adjoining houses for £100, retaining a small annuity for himself and his wife or the survivor of them, alleging that he was reduced to poverty by Woodford's multiple suits against him from 1613 to 1623. On 3 May 1624 he obtained

¹ C 24/502.

² C 24/500 and 501.

³ C 24/304; C, D and O, 1601 A, ff. 573, 611, 643, 648, 735, 798.

⁴ Chanc. Proc. Elz. H 31/34; C 24/497/6 and 7; C 3, 390/47, and Decrees and Orders, 1623 A, f. 785, 1623 B, f. 918; St. Ch. 8, 31/16.

judgment in Chancery against Woodford, with costs of 46s. 8d., in the suit which furnishes this, and other, information. Signs illiterately *a h.*¹

KEBLE, William, of St Sepulchre's, goldsmith, age 55 on 17 July 1623.

Engrossed the grant, drawn up by William Jourdan, of June 1617, and witnessed its sealing. Signs *Willham Keble*, elaborately.

KING, John, of St Sepulchre's, age 48 on 29 June 1623. A life-long intimate of the company, which he served as hired man (certainly a player) since 1593 or earlier, 'to the companie of Sharers of the players of the redd Bull'. Discusses wages paid to him 'when he came first to bee enterteyned in the said howse & company'. Signs *John King*, poorly.²

LANGLEY, Francis, Citizen and Draper of London, of Old Paris Garden, age 49 on 8 February 1597 and age 30 on 18 October 1578. Brother of Richard Langley (b. ca. 1563). Married Jane Ashley, sister of Sir Anthony Ashley. Much concerned with theatrical ventures, e.g. the Boar's Head and the Swan. Died in 1601, heavily in debt.³

LEIGH or LEE, Robert, of St James's, Clerkenwell, age 54 on 18 November 1623. A member of the company before 1612, with Greene. Left in 1612, before the death of Pulham. Rejoined Christmas 1618 but left soon after 'upon some discontents falling out amongst them'. Knew Susan Baskerville since ca. 1594, Worth since 1605, Cumber since 1608-9, Blaney since 1615. Signs *Robt Leigh*, boldly.⁴

PERKINS, Richard, of St James's, Clerkenwell, age 44 on 13 and 14 October 1623. A full sharer in the company. Left before the covenant of 3 June 1617. Signs *R: Perkins*, free and flourished.⁴

PULHAM, George. Joined the company in 1611, giving £60 for a half share. Died 1612. £40 paid to his executors for his half share.⁴

READ, Emanuel. Promised Heywood to sign the covenant of June 1617, but did not sign.⁴

REYNOLDS, Robert. Promised Heywood to sign the covenant of June 1617, but did not sign.⁵

RHODES, John, Citizen and Draper of London, age 60 on 30 May 1665.⁶ Bought $\frac{1}{24}$ share in the Fortune Theatre and held it from before 1640 to 1648.⁷ Signs *John Rhodes*, neat, clear writing.

¹ Chanc. Pro. Eliz. H 31/34; C 24/497/6 and 7, C 3, 390/47, and Decrees and Orders, 1623 A, f. 785, 1623 B, f. 918; St. Ch. 8, 31/16.

² C 24/500 and 501.

³ C 24/254/53, C 24/134, C 24/299, C 24/304 and 305, and others.

⁴ C 24/500 and 501.

⁵ C 24/500 and 501.

⁶ Reference missing.

⁷ C 5/381/95, C 5/399/81, C 7/101/132.

ROBERTS, William, of Chancery Lane, gent., age 30 on 13 August 1623.

Engrossed the agreement of June 1615 for 1s. 8d. per day. Signs *Willm Roberts*.¹

ROSSETER, Phillip, of St Bridget's, age 33 on 2 June 1601.²

STONE, Phillip, of the Middle Temple, gent., age 38 on 10 February 1622, and age 55 on 28 October 1637. Signs *Ph: Stone*, in a clumsy large hand, with a paraphe.³

THAYER, John. Bought a half share in the company. Died 1612-13.¹

WALPOLE, Francis, of St Mary Aldermary, Citizen and Merchant Taylor of London, age 38 on 17 September 1623. Paid £40 for a three-quarter share in the company. Received nothing for his share on leaving *ca.* 1618. Signed the covenant. Signs *Francis Walpoole*, clear, neat, small script.¹

WOODFORD, Thomas. Son of Gamaliel Woodford, Grocer, of London. He requires an article to himself, as does Langley. The material is too plentiful to summarise. See also 'Mr and Mrs Browne of the Boar's Head', in *Life and Letters Today*, Winter 1936.

WORTH, Ellis, of White Cross Street, St-Giles-without-Cripplegate, gent., age 67 on 1 February 1654. Joined Red Bull company in 1612, in place of Pulham, paying to Beeston £40 for Pulham's half share, before the death of Greene. Signed the covenant of 1617. Married, (1) Frances — and (2) after 1654, Katherine — who survived him. By Frances he had a son Ellis, and by Katherine two daughters, Katherine and Blandina. His first wife, Frances, was a woman surgeon for skin diseases, including leprosy, at St Bartholomew's Hospital, and taught the son her art. Ellis the second was a surgeon at Christ's Hospital. He was born in 1628 and married (1) Sarah Earle (b. in 1632) and (2) Sarah Baggs on 10 June 1654. Ellis Worth owned houses in Blue Anchor Alley, Whitecross Street, worth over £40 *p.a.*, and lived in his own house in Church Yard Alley there. He died in 1661, and was a freeman of the Merchant Taylors' Company. He left £66 to his infant daughters. He signs *Ellis Woorth* (as does his son), clearly and well, in the 1654 document as in the Star Chamber document of 1623.⁴

The signatures of Aaron Holland, Thomas Woodford and Edward Peers, Master of the Children of St Pauls, are reproduced in *Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age*, Plate 1.

¹ C 24/500 and 501.

² C 24/496/84, C 24/624/166.

⁴ C 24/785; St. Ch. 8, 31/16; Repertories 67 and 68.

² Reference missing.

II. SHARES IN THE RED BULL COMPANY

It is difficult to arrive at any firm conclusion regarding the real significance of a 'share' in the Red Bull company as an asset. According to Drewe, it was agreed among the sharers that the value of a full share was £80, of a three-quarter share £60, of a half share £40, to be paid upon the death of the sharer to his executors by the surviving sharers. And there is little reason to doubt this statement. Such an agreement was to the benefit of all sharers. Shares were bought. For example, George Pulham paid £60 for a half share on joining in 1611, borrowing money to make his investment. When Pulham died, Ellis Worth bought his half share for £40, which was paid over to his executors. Francis Walpole paid £40 for a three-quarter share on joining, before 1616. The company, in effect, agreed to consider that they owed Thomas Greene's executors, i.e. his widow Susan, £80, the value of a full share, in 1612.

But it is clear that such an agreement or understanding, if it existed, could only be valid in a stable company. As Beeston put it, 'every man's share ends, whensoever the company dissolveth'. And a state of flux or uncertainty had much the same effect. Arguments are made to the effect that Pulham's was an exceptional case, as he died so soon after paying the high price of £60 for a half share, and had died in debt on account of this payment. It was not, said Beeston, 'absolutely in respect of his half share'. Every attempt was made, on behalf of Worth and Blaney, to argue similarly that the company did not owe Greene's estate £80 strictly in respect of his share, but in respect of money advanced by him to cover running expenses of the company. Evidence is given by Heywood, Walpole and Perkins that when they left the company, they were paid nothing for the surrender of their shares. Walpole tells us that Thomas Albone, a three-quarter sharer, died about 1618, but his executors received nothing. Perkins confirms this, and adds similar information, confirmed by Heywood, about John Thayer, a half sharer, who died about 1612-13. When the company agreed to give Susan Greene a half share, after Leicester's intervention on her behalf, the intention certainly was rather to pay her claim in instalments than to give her a permanent share in the company on the same footing as the actor-sharers.

Beeston's observation, however, clearly implies the truth of its converse, namely that every man's share continues until the company dissolves, and has thus conditional permanence and therefore capital value as well as a right to dividends. But it is clear that the decisive concept

of a share was a dividend value. The purchase of an office of profit, under the Crown, e.g., would be a fair analogy in any question of its capital value. It was worth what you could get for it. While the company was apparently stable, and making good profits, a share was a saleable commodity, and purchasers were to be found. So Greene's and Pulham's shares had capital value, during the peak of the company's career, and they were eagerly replaced by men of the standing of Beeston and Worth. The company, says Heywood, were taking £8 to £9 a day then. Later on, however, the company was evidently on the downgrade.

The departure of Heywood, a prolific and popular playwright, was a grave loss. When Perkins left, the company lost an actor second to none in London. Two of the company's principal assets had vanished. It would, moreover, have been difficult to make out a case for enabling them to desert the company, taking with them a great part of its goodwill, without loss to themselves. The company's finances were extremely involved, and they were in the hands of their leaders. It seems to be agreed that Greene had taken 'the profits of the half galleries' without accounting to the company for them, and that subsequently Beeston, in sole charge of the company's receipts and expenditures, gave little or no account to his fellows for 'their Galleries money'. Certainly, the company was in low water. In 1617, says Drewe, the company's 'Gettings were but small', and the burden of payments to Susan was so great that they 'would have put downe the Flag' had she not accepted less in 1618. Beeston speaks of 'great debts' owed by the company even at the time of Greene's death, 'not denying but that the company was then very poore'. Even at its peak, it would seem, the company was in fact, with all its appearance of prosperity and popularity, living from hand to mouth.

The best proof of the general improvidence and financial instability of the company is perhaps a story told by Mrs Gertrude Browne in November 1623:

vpon a tyme about 5 'or 6' yeares agone in Sum̃er last...it was hir chance after the end of a Play, at the red Bull ..to be in Company with the now compl. Worthe, James Baskervile...the...defts Susan & W^m Browne hir sonne, drinking a cup of Wyne together, at a Taverne on Clerkenwell Greene And...at the same tyme, amongst other words that then passed amongst them, 'shee'.. heard the compl: Worthe say vnto...James Baskervile to this, or like effect, viz^t Father Baskervile, why doe yo^u not buy something amongst vs, I pray yo^u buy something amongst vs And I will see That you shall haue yo^r Right, And...afterwards 'by reporte' there was some Pençon of twenty pence by the day, bought by...M^r Baskervile of the... then Company, or some other pençon, w^{ch} was afterwards payd by the...Company.

Mrs Browne is possibly confusing the events of 1615 and of 1616, or is merely vague about dates. By the summer of 1617 Baskervile was

already in exile in Ireland. But the root of the matter is revealed truthfully. And surely only an urgent need for ready money would have induced a responsible member of the company to invite an outsider to purchase what amounted to a share in the company, and to enter into bonds to that effect. The money was soon spent, and a year later a further payment was gained in return for an increased 'pension'. Altogether, it would seem, Susan's family had advanced in actual cash to the company, apart from the value of Greene's full share (£80), sums of £37. 10s. 0d., £57. 10s. 0d., and £38, in addition to arrears of 'pension' remitted amounting to £72 in 1616. Such a drain upon the shareable profits, amounting to a guinea a week, the cost of two or three hired men, was a burdensome prior charge and would make a 'share' a much less desirable or valuable asset. The permanent or capital value of a share, in fact, seems to have been a market value rather than an absolute value.

The general attitude of Beeston and those other actors who had left the company, as indicated in their evidence, seems to be that a share in a company has a purchase price but no sale price or surrender value. This seems an unlikely position for the sharer to accept. As against this, there is strong evidence of a real agreement, whether legally binding or not, probably not. Drewe states the terms of the agreement:

he hath heard it rumored amongst the...Company, That there was an agreemt made by, them, That yf any of the. .Company dyed being a full Sharer, his wief should have fourscore pounds payed her, by the surviuors of y^t Company, yf a half Sharer, fortie pounds, And yf a three quarters Sharer, threescore pounds, ratably. But whether any such Shares or parts haue, or hath bin pd, or not, this dept sayth he doth not cteinly knowe.

And he heard Beeston and Worth, after Pulham's death, discussing the payment of £40 to Pulham's executors. Robert Leigh was firm on the subject. The company owed Susan £80 in respect of Greene's share:

According to an Agreement Amongst themselves formly made, concerning the parte & Share of eūy one of the Sharers & half Sharers of that Company.

Even Heywood accepts the position that the payment to Pulham's executors was 'according to an Agreemt'. Beeston is guarded on the general question; he has not

to his nowe best Remembrance credibly heard of any such matter resolved or fully agreed vpon.

But Perkins enters a flat denial:

neither doth this dept knowe any reason that any thing should be demaunded in that kind for...there was never any agreemt made betwene the...company for the allowing to the executors or administrators of such as should dye or to such as should depart the...Company any some of Mony whatso ever.

It is well to bear in mind that Leigh was an old friend of Susan and of

Greene. And he had been something of a bird of passage in the company, leaving, rejoining, and leaving again: 'vpon some discontents falling out amongst them'. In general, he seems to favour Susan in the debate. And he was no longer financially involved in the issue.

But there is corroboration for his position in the practice of other companies. Charles Massey's letter to Alleyn in 1613, in the *Henslowe Papers*, defines the custom of the Admiral's Men in respect of a sharer leaving with the consent of his fellows, or dying, giving specific instances. The value of a share was a testamentary asset, as when Cooke, of the King's Men, left £80 in his will in respect of his share.

There is further evidence, which introduces a complication into the question, in a Commonwealth Chancery suit, the proceedings in which were discovered and used by Professor Hotson, and independently, together with the depositions (as yet unpublished), by Miss Eleanore Boswell (Mrs Murrie). It bears upon the practice of the sharers at the Fortune Theatre around the year 1624, the same company to which Massey refers in 1613, now under the patronage of the Palsgrave, and under the control of Richard Gunnell. Here bonds, entered into by actors to their leader, were intended to ensure that they should not break away from the company without a penalty of £40. Evidence is given by the surviving actors, in 1654, that this was a common practice in London theatres. If so, a different light is thrown upon the evidence that certain actors, on leaving the Red Bull company, received nothing for their surrendered shares. The surrender of a share, without payment of its value, might well have been made in lieu of payment of a penalty for breaking away from the company. And this evidence is therefore worthless.

Further corroboration comes in another suit, begun in Michaelmas 1600, of which I found evidence in Chancery Decrees and repercussions elsewhere. This refers to the time when the Red Bull company, then Worcester's Men, were at the Boar's Head in Whitechapel. John Duke, Heywood, and other members of the company were counter-suing Robert Browne, who was suing them upon bonds entered into by them to him. Six sharers had bound themselves to Browne to play at his Boar's Head theatre and not elsewhere. Browne made verbal promises, including the return of their bonds. The actors failed to pursue their suit, therefore, and were non-suited, on 17 May 1601, and ordered to pay 40s. costs. Browne retained their bonds, however. The suit was reopened, and the costs quashed. The final order was made by the Court on 28 June 1601, dismissing the suit and recommending Browne to proceed, and Duke and Heywood to defend themselves, if they wished, elsewhere. Browne's

Answer to their Bill, challenged by them, was approved by the Court, and Duke and Heywood and the rest were ordered to pay Browne 26s. 8d. costs. I do not know whether Browne proceeded further in the matter or not. But the root of the matter was the seizure of the theatre by Francis Langley, the story of which I have told in part in 'Mr and Mrs Browne of the Boar's Head' (*Life and Letters Today*, Winter 1936, pp. 99-107). In Michaelmas 1600 Langley was able to force the actors to enter into bonds to pay him £3 a week while using the theatre by his permission. A phrase in the Decree is doubly significant:

Forasmuch as the Lord Keeper was...ynformed...that the suyte between the parties in this Cort ys for certen bonds w^{ch} were made between them beinge players for shares due in their playes w^{ch} his Lo^p thyncks noe meete matter for this Cort .

There was evidently confusion between bonds entered into by actors to keep together at a theatre, and agreements concerning shares in the company. And the Court was reluctant to deal with contracts of this nature, either because of their intangible quality, or because they were beneath the dignity of the Court, or for both reasons.

The conclusion of the matter might then seem to be this. The accepted and agreed value of a share was a safeguard of the interests of the individual sharer and of his family, being part of a body of assets, including goodwill as well as properties, playbooks and costumes, to which he had contributed either in money or by his skill, or both. But it was also a pawn or hostage by which the whole body of sharers safeguarded the general interests of the company. The actual and real value of a share depended upon the condition of the company and of the trade in which it was engaged. It seems pretty clear that it was not an asset likely to justify itself in a Court of Law. It was very different, of course, with a share by lease in a playhouse building or ground.

There is room for further study of the question, in the light, for example, of the wills of Christopher Beeston and Robert Browne, printed by Mr Bentley. But I have little doubt that Sir Edmund Chambers takes a too favourable view of the real and permanent value of a share in a London company. The King's company was, I think, exceptional in its stability.

III. WAGES OF HIRED MEN

Evidence is given on this subject by Richard Baxter, John King, and Roger Clarke, in greater detail than any recorded by Sir Edmund Chambers.

Baxter, who dates the beginning of his career with the Red Bull company to 1609-10, had a general agreement with the company that he should receive 10s. a week certain. The agreement was not a contract entered into by any individual sharer or sharers, nor did the company ever make such formal contracts. It was a promise and an understanding, on the strength of which he agreed to serve the company. In practice, Baxter bore his share in the loss when takings were small, as was usual in the company. Their hired men were sometimes, for this reason, paid half their agreed wages, sometimes even less, and sometimes nothing. Baxter kept a record of these deficits, which he considered as arrears, but could never recover them from the company.

King began his career as a hired man to the company in 1593 or earlier still. The amount of his wages was agreed upon, but he omits to state the figure. He was, however, to bear his share of the company's loss, as was usual in this company. Over the period of thirty years' service, the deficit in his case amounted to £100, which he seems to think far too great a sum to expect reasonably to recover.

Clarke agreed with the company for 6s. a week when he joined (in 1621). The agreement was 'so sett downe in their booke' (probably the 'great account book' mentioned in *Believe as you List*, when used as a property). This amount was paid when the takings were good and could bear it. Otherwise his wages went down to 2s. 6d. or even 2s. a week. So it was in all London companies: hired men, in effect, were paid proportionately their share of the takings, up to a maximum agreed. It may be observed that 6s. a week was the standard wage for a journeyman in all trades at that time.

It is probable that wages agreed upon varied according to the quality of the man. Clarke and King were barely literate, to judge by their signatures, and King was probably a general hack, odd job, and 'extra' man. Baxter, on the contrary, was clearly literate, and apparently apprenticed to the company at an early age, and taught his trade. It was as a reward for long and good service and possibly in lieu of arrears of wages, it would seem likely, that he was made a sharer in the company in 1623. He was useful enough to be taken into the King's company later on.

As for reduced wages in hard times, the points of view of the sufferers vary. Clarke seems to consider such an arrangement both reasonable and normal in all London companies. King and Baxter seem to be resigned to their fate, though Baxter kept a record of arrears and sought to recover them. Possibly his pertinacity helped to earn for him his

ultimate share in the company. But Susan and her son William Browne certainly had no doubts on the subject. When they sued the company at Common Law in 1617, Browne's claim to arrears of wages, amounting to £16. 9s. 9*d.*, was one of the matters at issue, and was clearly considered to be susceptible of documentary support, possibly the record of the agreement kept in the company's account book mentioned by Clarke. And, in fact, when the company, after entering into the 1617 covenant with Susan, paid £17. 10s. 0*d.* cash as part of the settlement, it was mainly in respect of Browne's claim for arrears of wages. But Baxter puts his finger on the legal weakness of such a 'contract', namely the absence of individual undertakings. The company was a doubtful legal entity. And when Susan's advisers drew up the agreement of 1617, they had it signed by individual members of the company and supported by bonds similarly entered into by the individuals.

C. J. Sisson.

LONDON.

ROUSSEAU AND THE ROMANTIC EXPERIENCE

IN the hackneyed generalizations that sum up the influence of Rousseau on Romanticism, it is easy to lose an exact sense of the particular experience in which that vast influence had its rise. If he became, as he did become, the great precursor and inspirer of the new temper that swept Europe, it was by virtue of an attitude that in him was natural, an instinctive reaction to his own circumstances. But, almost inevitably, the critic tends to identify this primal mood with its considered expression when Rousseau himself had elaborated it into a formula, had dramatized it in the *Confessions* which displayed 'the purple pageant of his bleeding heart' to the world, and had shaped his temperamental affinities and revulsions into doctrine in the scheme of education in *Émile* or the social gospel propounded in the *Contrat Social*. At an even further remove we often fail to distinguish the Romantic experience at its birth from the stylized themes and expression it assumed when Romanticism had become the fashion, when Europe had learned the lesson, and instinctive reactions hardened into a literary attitude and technique. It is worth while trying to dissociate the original experience, the temperamental revolt, from all the monstrous growth of Romantic writing; and this can be done at the very point at which Rousseau himself discovered and analysed it for all time, with the minimum of idealization and dissimulation, in the famous series of letters to Malesherbes. There, uncontaminated by literary preoccupations, *avant la lettre* as it were, we find every elusive note of the Romantic scale struck with a singular sharpness and precision, and—what is fully as important—the essential attitude we have learned to call Romantic traced back to the quality of temperament or the clash of environment and character in which it had its source.

When these letters were written, in January 1762, Rousseau was a man of fifty, and had already produced his greatest work: the *Lettre à d'Alembert* in 1757, the *Nouvelle Héloïse* and the *Contrat Social* in 1761, *Émile* written and even then passing precariously through the press. The dangers, real and imaginary, which he experienced in the publication of *Émile* were, indeed, the occasion of the letter from Malesherbes¹ which evoked Rousseau's impassioned self-analysis; and the characteristic

¹ Letter of Malesherbes to Rousseau, 25 December 1761.

story, excellently told by Prof. Rudler,¹ need not be retold here. For the present purpose it is enough to recognize that the tone of Malesherbes's letter—kindly, uncomprehending, quietly deprecatory of the other's excitements and suspicions—roused him to send his unsolicited reply and determined the form it took. To this friendly worldling, who respected passion yet failed to understand the passions that dominated Rousseau, he felt that he could and would justify his love of solitude, his flight from the world. So, in less than a month, 'sans brouillon, rapidement, à trait de plume',² the four letters were written: the first on the 4th of January, the second on the 12th, the third on the 26th, and the fourth two days later, on the 28th. Written at burning speed, they are a kind of first draft of the *Confessions*, as Rousseau recognized when, fearing that he might not live to complete the fuller *apologia*, he asked Malesherbes to return them, so that this sketch at least might go down to posterity. But though, at every point, the larger work provides an interesting gloss, the earlier and simpler one is self-contained, and has its distinct and different value, and a greater integrity. When he flung off these letters Rousseau was already a practised master of his own fiery style, and so urgent was the impulse to release his over-charged spirit that there are fewer afterthoughts to blur the sharp truth of the picture, fewer special pleadings to be discounted, than in the *Confessions*. He never wrote with a greater directness and intensity, and in these letters we seem almost to be watching the Romanticism of the arch-Romantic go through the process of birth.

A wise and kindly sentence in Malesherbes's letter gives him his text:

J'ai vu dans tous vos procédés une extrême sensibilité, un grand fond de mélancolie et beaucoup de disposition à voir les objets du côté le plus noir, mais une disposition au moins égale à vous rendre à la justice et à la vérité quand elle vous est présentée.

This is not the truth about himself as Rousseau sees it, and Malesherbes's points have therefore to be met. The 'sensibilité' and the 'mélancolie' he admits, but interprets them in his own fashion, shorn of their damaging implications. He has 'un cœur sensible', but it is not 'sensible' to public opinion; in Paris he had indeed felt himself consumed by the 'mélancolie' that could be traced in his writings, but in his retreat had won a serenity of mind that only his immediate fears for the fate of *Émile* had disturbed. This simple reply, however, does not go all the way towards justifying Rousseau's conduct in his own eyes or in those of Malesherbes; and it is

¹ *Lettres à Malesherbes*: Introduction, Scholartis Press, 1928.

² *Confessions*, Book XI, ch. III.

typical of his whole method that he tacitly deprecates an implied compliment by refusing to allow that it is his hatred of injustice and wickedness alone that decided him to flee the society of man. His motive is less exalted and more personal: he was born with a natural love of solitude which has only increased as he came to know men better. These are the elements in his nature and experience that need the analysis which he proceeds to give in the first two letters. Very briefly summarized, his argument is this. The ultimate cause of his love of solitude was not, as for a long time he had wrongly thought, his sense of his own inadequacy in society—his slow-wittedness in company, his consciousness of unrecognized merit. When he attained distinction, his distaste for the world was only intensified, and he was driven to find some other cause for his *inquiétude*, his intolerable *ennui*. This cause he found in an unquenchable 'esprit de liberté', which had its roots not in pride but in 'paresse', the consequences of which he sums up thus: 'l'espèce de devoir qu'il me faut, n'est pas tant de faire ce que je veux, que de ne pas faire ce que je ne veux pas.' The second letter then becomes an amplification of this argument, but an amplification that is essential to the understanding of the qualities Rousseau recognized in himself, and of what a later psychology would call their sublimation in his doctrines and the books embodying them.

In this analysis of his temperament it is important to distinguish, as far as may be, between the core of hard truth and the excrescences adhering to it and coloured by Rousseau's own wishes and imagination. When he says 'Je suis né avec un amour naturel pour la solitude', he is speaking the truth; when he adds 'qui n'a fait qu'augmenter à mesure que j'ai mieux connu les hommes', he is not. Almost unconsciously, he is turning the fact into a plausible, even a laudable, explanation of his inability to live in society. If we ask why men seem to him increasingly wicked and unjust the more he knows them, the answer is because they make him uneasy and cramp his freedom; they are thus wicked and unjust to him, and it is only a step to find them wicked and unjust in themselves. His very next sentence betrays that this condemnation of humanity has its source in Rousseau, not in human conduct: 'Je trouve mieux mon compte avec les êtres chimériques que je rassemble autour de moi qu'avec ceux que je vois dans le monde'; for the 'êtres chimériques' will come and go at his bidding, and he need not adjust himself to them. So in the passage where he analyses his 'invincible dégoût' for the 'commerce des hommes', there is the same fascinating, sometimes intensely irritating blend of truth, half-truth and even falsehood. We at once

recognize the explanation as squaring with all the facts of his life when we read:

Je l'attribuois au chagrin de n'avoir pas l'esprit assez présent pour montrer dans la conversation le peu que j'en ai, et, par contrecoup, à celui de ne pas occuper dans le monde la place que j'y croyois mériter.

But Rousseau will have none of it. He cannot bear the pain of contemplating his own failure, and therefore dismisses the real reason as false and proceeds to discover a philosophic basis for his hatred of society which he can reconcile with the nobler being he knows himself to be, and, incidentally, with the general ideas he has developed in his works. The true root of his misanthropy, then, is his *esprit de liberté*; but, by a characteristic, penetrating admission, that in turn has its roots in his *paresse*, in a nature not framed to discharge uncongenial social obligations. Here, it might be supposed, we have come back to the truth; but we have come back by such a devious path that it is not quite the same truth. 'L'esprit de liberté. . . devant lequel les honneurs, la fortune et la réputation même ne me sont rien' is well in the centre of Rousseau's gaze and ours, and the vice, if so it may be called, in which it has its origin has fallen into the background. But, being Rousseau, he is not content to leave it there. In a moment, by a subtle shift of attitude, this very *paresse* becomes a virtue when he opposes the unnatural conditions to which it was his natural response to 'l'intime amitié' which knows nothing of social obligations, which knows no duties, only instincts and feelings. Here, again, is the truth, but by now he has so twisted things that it is society that is incontrovertibly wrong, and Rousseau that is right. He can now embrace, with passionate abandon and conviction, the only duty that remains to him: not 'de faire ce que je veux', but 'de ne pas faire ce que je ne veux pas'. Beyond that law of his nature there is no appeal.

It would be wrong to see a lack of sincerity in this passionately conceived, subtly woven tissue of instinct and argument. As ever, Rousseau argues from himself, and all thought in him proceeds from feeling; what he feels to be true is true. But to see the dynamic, creative power of his gospel at its source it is essential to isolate and examine this *paresse*, as Rousseau himself does in the second letter. 'Une âme paresseuse qui s'effraie de tout soin', yoked to 'un tempérament ardent, bilieux, facile à s'affecter et sensible à l'excès à tout ce qui l'affecte'—in these searching phrases he lays bare the irreconcilable extremes of his nature. The world, even for a small boy, being what it was and is, this *paresse* early took its inevitable form—and the word he uses is significant—'cet ennui de tout',

to which there was only one antidote: 'Je cherchois toujours ce qui n'étoit point.' The desire to escape from reality found food, from his earliest years, in reading—Plutarch and novels, especially the sentimental and heroic romances of the seventeenth century; and these in turn fed his sensibility: 'Ils m'avoient fait verser des seaux de larmes.'¹ He lived in a dream-world, and the good or ill fortune that gave him, in his years with Mme Warens, a taste of it in reality, so shaped him that he went through the rest of his life a strange sort of Protestant Psyche in search of his lost happiness. The social and political writings, therefore, are a reflexion, an idealized diagram, as it were, of the dream; and though the sentences that here relate how his vocation came to him, on the road to Vincennes one hot summer's day in 1749, have not the finished art of the famous passage in the *Confessions*, they have an intense sincerity and directness which communicate an even more immediate sense of the sudden, overwhelming conversion of his personal experience of men into a gospel for all mankind—the revelation of the social corruption of man, man who is naturally and intrinsically good. Twelve years later he still lives in the glory of that ecstasy; and we are not minimizing its splendour if we have also to allow that it brought some hardening of Rousseau's tissues. Instincts give place to ideas; *ennui* and a *désir* for the unknown are transmuted into principles, which can be advanced as a logical justification for his own conduct. He, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, is 'l'homme naturellement bon'; but he cannot remain 'bon' in a society that is corrupt, nor can he remain 'heureux'. Therefore it is plainly his duty to flee from the world of cities and *philosophes* to a place where he may live in solitude, safe from the corruption and the injustice of social man, and free from the temptation to return evil for evil. This innocent asylum he has found at Montmorency; and the self-justification to Malesherbes is complete. But the elaborately disguised instincts take their revenge, and we are suddenly reminded that these apparently unshakable principles are after all merely a substitute for his *inquiétude*, for the *désir* whose fulfilment must always melt in his grasp, which he himself knows will always be unattainable. He calls his state freedom, but it is strangely like a synonym for the 'uneasiness' of Locke:

Libre! non, je ne le suis pas encore... mais si, contre mon attente, je puis aller jusque-là,² croyez, Monsieur, qu'alors je serai libre... O jour trois fois heureux! Non, il ne me sera pas donné de le voir.

¹ It is interesting to compare this with Scott's equally faithful account of Edward Waverley's, i.e. his own, youthful dreams, inclinations and pursuits in the opening chapters of *Waverley*.

² The publication of a collected edition of his works.

With the close of the second letter, Rousseau's theme shifts from the analysis of his own nature, and it is therefore well to see where this has led. We have to remember that it is easy to overestimate the amount of falsification, of self-deception and posturing in what he says. Of course he wants to be the sole witness, counsel and judge in his own case; and that is suspicious. But it is also reassuring. This *Apologia pro Vita sua* is written for himself as well as for Malesherbes. For his own enlightenment he searches the depths of his nature with all the analytic, introspective power of which he is capable, and time and again his probe finds the vital core. 'Une âme paresseuse, qui s'effraie de tout soin'—it is a deadlier thrust than any that his enemies could have given, though, characteristically, Rousseau ends by exalting into a virtue this constitutional *paresse* not far removed from the *Accidia* which the medieval Church held to be one of the deadliest of the Seven Deadly Sins. Were that all, one might be content to leave it there, and leave Rousseau to his occasional fleeting enjoyments of an Arcadia in which he only wanted to remain for ever—without paying the entrance fee. But nobody ever practised *paresse* more consistently than the philosopher whose ideal society depended on the faithful and willing discharge by each man of his daily contribution to the common good. There the other extreme of his nature comes in, 'un tempérament ardent, bileux, facile à s'affecter et sensible à l'excès à tout ce qui l'affecte'. The negative inability to endure the touch of reality had its counterpart in a passionate abandonment to a world of sensations and emotions; and the result was the transmutation into other terms of the happy idyll of Les Charmettes. The schemes and treatises are all Jean-Jacques Rousseau sublimating his weaknesses, giving form to his entranced and passionate dream by refashioning the world nearer to his heart's desire. The games he played with these intellectual toys are a self-deception, but self-deception on a magnificent scale, with creative fire and electrifying power.

When we consider the form it took and its hold on that generation and every succeeding one, it is illuminating to compare Rousseau's with the Golden Age of another Romantic.¹ Fleeing, in his turn, from a world in which he could never be happy and at home, Shelley forgot his disillusion in the vision of a state when even the seasons would alter, warm winds would blow about the poles and the desert blossom like the rose, the lion would lie down with the lamb, and man and woman be

¹ Rousseau's direct influence upon or kinship with various French writers has been often and meticulously noted. To establish the general identity of the Romantic experience it has therefore seemed best to suggest some English parallels.

perfectly equal—free, classless, tribeless, nationless, and vegetarian¹ That is a poet's vision, the sublimation of his uneasiness and his longing. The form it took in Rousseau has had more influence, partly because its dogmatic formulas and method lend it an illusory resemblance to a practicable reality. In an age of *philosophes*, of thinkers of all sorts and in every direction busily working out curious systems of nature, religion, society, it was inevitable that Rousseau, too, should produce his system, his working model of what was in truth a dream world, as insubstantial and timeless as Shelley's. He had the itch of his century to formulate and arrange and classify, and the result is a system of education in *Émile*, of religion in the *Profession* of the Savoyard Vicar, of society in the *Contrat Social*. But it is a mistake to judge these solely, or even mainly, on their intellectual merits. The sheer ingenuity in them is remarkable, often irritating. But the force that shaped them was not intellectual; it was emotional: not reason, but what that century, in France as in England, meant by sensation. 'Une âme paresseuse' and 'un tempérament ardent... facile à s'affecter et sensible à l'excès': in the heat engendered by these twin but opposing states the seed of the great works was sown; and that heat is their distinguishing quality: not the *lumen siccum* and the mind's search for truth, but the fever and passion of the uneasy existence of a Man of Feeling, whose emotional cravings remained permanently unsatisfied by his real experience. The heated temperature, which is a defect if the books are to be judged on the content of their argument, is the great source of their power.

It was the prevalence of an inner disquiet similar to his own beneath the confident and imposing surface of the eighteenth century that assured the electric contact of Rousseau's writings with that and the next generation. If they read the letters to Malesherbes,² many of his contemporaries must have recognized in his diagnosis the disease from which they, too, were suffering; and just as his principles of social hygiene are conditioned by his own maladjustments, so was the temper of the new age by that of the one that preceded it. The point is worth considering for a moment for the light it throws on the essential Romantic experience and the form it characteristically assumed. Put briefly, and when the individual variations are taken into account, it was the fundamental assumption of the eighteenth century that they were indeed the heirs of all the intellectual ages, the inheritors of the knowledge, the continuators of the civilization of antiquity. In their hands were accumu-

¹ *Prometheus Unbound*, Act III, and Shelley's poetry, *passim*.

² First published in 1780.

lated the material advantages of progress, the refinements of culture, the means of carrying knowledge, as yet unexampled in the history of the world, to ever greater heights. The best life known to man was therefore the life which made the fullest possible use of those benefits, naturally at their maximum in a great city; the finest product of the human race was the highly civilized, highly educated man: not the narrow scholar, but the layman versed in a broad culture, in all that is covered by the humanities, with a trained mind, a rich fund of general knowledge, understanding and at home in his intellectual, moral, social environment. It was possible for the eighteenth century to believe—as many of them did believe—without hypocrisy or mere insensitiveness, that all was for the best in the best of possible worlds; or, if improvement was necessary—and few would have denied it—that it would follow on the inevitable operation of such minds as theirs in circumstances so favourable. There was nothing, at least nothing that was humanly possible, outside their scope, nothing the enlightened reason could not know, nothing it could not do. The humanly impossible was not its affair, and no wise man would rashly meddle with it. This view of things is easily and often condemned as complacent; at its best it is nothing of the kind, but beautifully balanced, clear-sighted, harmonious. We had our share of it in England, where Gibbon is one of its finest flowers.¹ But on those who could not achieve this happy balance the effect was the state of feeling which Rousseau describes so poignantly, a constant sense of maladjustment, a *malaise* and *ennui*, a profound *inquiétude*. Many natures were inevitably distrustful of the secure advantages of civilization, bored and repelled by the exigencies of polite society; and uncongenial conditions bred melancholy,² the characteristic melancholy of the eighteenth century, and a thousand nervous diseases. One way of escape was obvious—into dreams of another kind of reality which would transcend the one from which they fled. As this temper gathers strength from many sources, the character of the new age becomes increasingly one of contrast and revolt against the old; instead of the clear light of classical antiquity, it exalts the beauty of the medieval twilight; instead of the enlightened reason of educated society, the primitive instincts of the natural man; instead of urbanity, sincerity; instead of logic, imagination; instead of intellect, feeling. The illumination for which the Romantics yearned was by its nature often unattainable; that was part of the ever unsatisfied longing

¹ For a significantly appreciative description of this English 'civilization' by two of its sharpest critics, see J. L. and Barbara Hammond, *The Village Labourer* (Conclusion).

Gray's word for his own state was '*leucocholy*', and it is a fitter term than *melancholy* for many sufferers in his century.

for fulfilment. As Sir Walter Raleigh truly if unkindly said, they are 'always falling upward, as it were, into vacuity. They love to lose themselves in an *O altitudo*.'¹ And that brings us full cycle to the maladjustments in which such desires have their origin. Classicism, Goethe said in his uncompromising way, is health, Romanticism is disease.

It should be obvious that the recognition of the soil in which they grew implies no disparagement of the flowers of poetry that the Romantic temper brought forth. Their beauty is quite another matter. But it would be misleading to leave this short analysis of the *ennui* which the great prophet of the coming age diagnosed in himself without a glance at the extraordinary revelation, at once metaphysical and poetic, of the positive side of Romantic experience in the third letter to Malesherbes. Written a fortnight after the preceding one, it is an eloquent description of the state of happiness he has attained in his retreat, a complete exposition of the inner life of a Romantic.

In what, then, did this state consist? First, and this is the essence of it all, 'mes désirs étoient la mesure de mes plaisirs'. He sought and found happiness in whatever his heart desired, no more and no less—no tiresome duties, no social or personal responsibilities, no unwelcome truths, no harsh realities.

De quoi jouissois-je enfin quand j'étois seul? De moi, de l'univers entier, de tout ce qui est, de tout ce qui peut être, de tout ce qu'a de beau le monde sensible, et d'imaginable le monde intellectuel: je rassemblois autour de moi tout ce qui pouvoit flatter mon cœur.

That opening 'de moi' conditions all the rest: himself and himself alone the measure of beauty in the world of the senses, of truth in the world of thought. It is, in quintessential form, the experience of the Romantic visionary, 'housed', as Wordsworth put it, 'in a dream, at distance from the kind'; and this rejection of objective reality only becomes clearer when Rousseau defines the exact form of his happy state. First we find the setting of so much Romantic literature when he draws a charming picture of his simple domestic life with his 'bonne et simple gouvernante', Thérèse. Rising before the sun, he would hurry through his necessary morning tasks, and then, after an early meal, be off into the country with his faithful dog. There, he could give himself up to the undisturbed enjoyment of Nature's beauty:

L'or des genêts et la pourpre des bruyères frappoient mes yeux d'un luxe qui touchoit mon cœur; la majesté des arbres qui me couvroient de leur ombre, la délicatesse des arbustes qui m'environnoient, l'étonnante variété des herbes et des fleurs que je foulois sous mes pieds tenoient mon esprit dans une alternative continuelle d'observation et d'admiration.

¹ Raleigh, Introduction to *Johnson on Shakespeare*, Oxford, 1915.

In these lines we have the germ of a host of Romantic descriptions of Nature, its visible beauty, its influence on the imagination and the feelings.

But this exquisite sensuous enjoyment was not enough; his mind peopled the lovely scene with human beings worthy of its loveliness, a society in which he felt himself not 'indigne'. As he recalls how, at times, the sense that these imaginings had no objective existence would plunge him into sadness, Rousseau gives a classic expression to the yearning for the unattainable that is typically Romantic. And in this passage there is something more: he puts with exquisite exactness one essential contradiction in Romantic feeling: the joy that accompanies sorrow, the pain that is also the most unalloyed pleasure known to the Romantic soul—the theme in English poetry, for example, of Shelley's *Skylark*:

Quand tous mes rêves se seroient tournés en réalités, ils ne m'auroient pas suffi; j'aurois imaginé, rêvé, désiré encore. Je trouvois en moi un vuide inexplicable, que rien n'auroit pu remplir, un certain élanement de cœur vers une autre sorte de jouissance, dont je n'avois pas d'idée et dont pourtant je sentoie le besoin. Hé bien, Monsieur, cela même étoit jouissance, puisque j'en étois pénétré d'un sentiment très vif et d'une tristesse attirante que je n'aurois pas voulu ne pas avoir.

From that mood it is an easy transition to the last stage in the cycle, a rapt contemplation of the whole system of nature and the incomprehensible Supreme Being in whose existence all forms of life are embraced. Here again the characteristically Romantic feeling is in its purest form and expression. The experience is marked by a complete suspension of the processes of thought, the intellectual faculty of discriminating between one kind of being and another; even the sense of personal identity is lost, and in a magnificent self-abandonment, for a few brief but immortal moments, the enraptured Romantic feels himself, like Shelley's redeemed mankind, outsoaring

The loftiest star of unascended heaven,
Pinnacled dim in the intense mane.

However much its details may vary, the content of this religious experience is always a kind of Pantheism, and the mood of which Rousseau gives a remarkably close analysis is to be found, with individual emphasis and intensity, in one Romantic writer after another:

Bientôt de la surface de la terre j'élevois mes idées à tous les êtres de la nature, au système universel des choses, à l'Être incompréhensible qui embrasse tout. Alors, l'esprit perdu dans cette immensité, je ne pensois pas, je ne *raisonnois pas*,¹ je ne philosophois pas; je me sentoie, avec une sorte de volupté, accablé du poids de cet univers, je me livrois avec ravissement à la confusion de ces grandes idées, j'aimois à me perdre en imagination dans l'espace; mon cœur resserré dans les bornes des êtres y trouvoit trop à l'étroit, j'étouffois dans l'univers, j'aurois voulu m'élancer dans

¹ The italics are mine.

l'infini. Je crois que, si j'eusse dévoilé tous les mystères de la nature, je me serois senti dans une situation moins délicate que cette étourdissante extase, à laquelle mon esprit se livroit sans retenue, et qui, dans l'agitation de mes transports, me faisoit écrier quelquefois: O grand Être! O grand Être! sans pouvoir dire ni penser rien de plus.

It is a characteristic paradox that the Romantic horror of the exact and the defined, its impatience of the bounds of human reason, its ecstatic self-abandonment to the vague and the illimitable, its self-surrender to dimly felt states of being that transcend time and place—all this has never been more exactly defined and expressed than here by Rousseau.

After that highlight of rapture, the walk which thus epitomizes the Romantic experience appropriately ends. Days such as this have given Rousseau, in Sir Thomas Browne's famous phrase, 'an handsome anticipation of heaven', and he assures Malesherbes in a kind of epilogue that he expects nothing better in the next world. He looks forward to death itself without fear, for after it he may be completely himself, and enjoy the continual experience of such bliss, unbroken by bodily suffering. And that, too, in its way is Romantic.

The inevitable comparison of this third letter with *The Winter Walk at Noon*¹ serves to bring out one feature of Rousseau's experience in yet stronger relief. By all ordinary standards Cowper was the greater sufferer of the two, and his agony sometimes found utterance that has a keener poignancy than anything in Rousseau. But though the malady that caused his black and dreadful isolation was deeper seated, it was in a way less chronic, one might almost say less pathological. *The Task* and the *Lettres à Malesherbes* therefore offer a curious contrast between Cowper's greater objectivity, his quick, observant sympathy with the natural and human life around him, and Rousseau's self-centred abandonment and recoil from any reality outside himself. He knows nothing of Cowper's innocent delight in the antics of his hares or the petty, amusing bustle of Olney. His dog, his 'vieille chatte', his Thérèse exist only to minister to Rousseau's needs, to fulfil *his* existence; and in this again he is wholly Romantic, the supreme example of the withdrawal from other lives and forms of experience which is the reverse side of the Romantic insistence on the paramount sanctity of the individual.

After the second and third of these letters, the fourth and last of the series could hardly be other than an anticlimax, though it is an extraordinarily interesting one, full of sudden, revealing strokes of self-knowledge and self-portraiture. In it he returns to the mood of personal explanation and defence; and what has perhaps the most direct bearing

¹ *The Task*, Book VI.

on the particular train of ideas we have been following is not the renewed justification of his retreat from the educated world, and his praise by contrast of the simple life of the peasants of Montmorency; nor is it the wonderful felicity of those compliments to his noble hosts and to Malesherbes which convey something of the charm that won Rousseau a constant succession of admirers and friends—if it could not keep them. It is rather his own pathetic recognition of the two-edged rock on which all his friendships broke. ‘J’ai un cœur très aimant’, he declares, ‘mais qui peut se suffire à lui-même. J’aime trop les hommes pour avoir besoin de choix parmi eux; je les aime tous, et c’est parce que je les aime que je les fuis.’ It is the truth, and yet not the truth. An undistinguishing love of his fellow-men was no good foundation for the friendship with this man or that woman that Rousseau’s nature craved. But it was not the controlling impulse in his life that he would have himself and us believe; all his affections were conditioned by the *paresse* which led him, soon rather than late, to refuse every demand made upon him by man or circumstance, recoil from the consequences of his own easily excited enthusiasms. A fervid craving for friendship, with a deep constitutional inability either to perform himself or to tolerate from others the offices of friendship—that was the unresolved dilemma in which Rousseau perpetually found himself, the root cause of successive, tragic ruptures. It is a fairly common phenomenon of the Romantic temperament, but in no one’s life did it cause as much wreckage as in Rousseau’s, and it is difficult to gauge its share in giving direction to his positive writings. His own reading of his friendless state is of prime interest in this last, burning letter to Malesherbes.

Ending as he began on a note of personal, particular explanation, Rousseau has come full cycle in these famous letters which give so complete and close an analysis of the Romantic psychology, the aesthetic and even the themes of the Romantic movement. In the first we discover the germ and breeding-ground in a disposition to *paresse* and a state of *ennui*, with their attendant emotional experiences of *sensibilité* and melancholy, which find their natural outlet in a love of solitude. Here already is the psychological origin and foundation of the great imaginative superstructure of Romanticism; and in the second letter, where this profound *inquiétude* is further analysed, we get the classic account of how it discovered its positive expression and its escape from the harsh restrictions of reality, in a word its sublimation, that day in the summer of 1749 when Rousseau found his vocation as the prophet of a regenerated world. It is no longer a question of mere negative inhibitions, but rather

of the positive form they take in giving a fresh, beautiful and imaginatively powerful interpretation of man's attitude to Nature, his fellow-men, and what Rousseau calls 'l'Être Suprême'. So, in the third letter, we have a Romantic manifesto, more comprehensive and far-reaching than the *Préface de Cromwell*. Here, if anywhere, is the gospel of Romanticism, the true milk of the word. First comes the fundamental position: 'Mes désirs. .la mesure de mes plaisirs'—the wishes of the individual heart the only criterion of reality; then the insistence on the form these 'plaisirs' will take, Rousseau holds, in every man who lives in accordance with his natural desires and not the false standards of society and the equally false dictates of what Wordsworth called the 'meddling intellect'. A simple life remote from towns, in a solitude as complete as possible; in touch with Nature, his senses, feelings and imagination responding to her beauty; his relations with mankind sublimated into a citizenship of an ideal society of noble and natural souls—this is Rousseau's picture of man's true state, his exquisite miniature of the vision of human bliss that was to absorb the imagination and occupy the faculties of one Romantic artist after another. But even in this land of Beulah man would not find all his desires fulfilled; he would always experience a yearning for something beyond his reach, an unattained and unattainable perfection his conception of which is an earnest of man's greatness, giving him at once the keenest delight in its contemplation and the keenest pain at his failure to reach it. And so, inevitably, to the next step, man's sensation of oneness with the whole universe, in an ecstatic self-surrender in which he loses the consciousness of personal identity altogether, and becomes part of the Being which pervades and transcends Time and Space. From that visionary mood the last letter makes a sharp return to Rousseau's harsher world of everyday; but no less surely than in the psychological analysis of the second letter or the creative beauty of the third, the lineaments its self-portraiture reveals are not those of Rousseau alone, but of the indubitable, quintessential, permanent Romantic type. In spite of their intense concentration of feeling and expression, the *Lettres à Malesherbes* must rank as one of Rousseau's minor works, but, as this article has tried to show, they are documents of the first importance to the study of the birth, growth and fruition of the Romantic experience and of its historic manifestation in the Romantic movement.

L. A. BISSON.

OXFORD.

RIMBAUD—MICHELET—VICO

READERS of the *Saison en Enfer* who are also readers of the Italian historical philosopher Vico must have been struck by the likeness between the two systems of thought. Yet, to my knowledge, attention has not yet been drawn to this likeness, perhaps because a clue was lacking as to how Rimbaud came to use Vico.

Rimbaud found himself condemned by society as a result of the Brussels affair, and the effect on him was so profound that he proceeded to condemn himself the poetical method of conduct he had followed. The manner of his self-condemnation is peculiar.

He does not deny that in following out a poetic pantheism he was obeying the course of nature and even of truth. He saw (vide *Saison en Enfer*) that all beings have a fatality of happiness; yet calls the fact a 'sophisme de folie'. He concludes that his conduct though naturally right was socially wrong, and therefore could not but be wrong for him as a man. The *Saison en Enfer* is a dramatization of a return to the social sense on the part of a man who had done his best to get rid of it. He seeks again the key to the happiness of his childhood. Charity is that key. The ultimate declaration of that law is Christianity, which is therefore the *sine qua non* of social science. Christianity is a 'declaration of science'. It is permitted to none to revert to the senses, the pagan paradise of pantheism. This paradise is the hell of which the Son of Man opened the gates. It is true that the social law of Christianity is so boring that men of imagination since it was proclaimed have been looking for something else—and only succeeded in proving its truth (the method termed in geometry 'proof by exhaustion'). His own fugue would at all times have been insane as at all times man was social, but it is pre-eminently insane to-day when the whole world proclaims the law of work and service. The plebs has conquered. Everything has been taken from sorcerers and vagabonds. He recognizes that by his bad blood—he is a Gaul—he was predestined to social ineptitude. Nevertheless he conquers—he is saved. Morning comes. Victory is his and he will re-enter the ways of men.

He does not re-enter it however as a Christian. Though he has spoken of the 'consoling cross' shining down on his pagan torments, though he has pronounced Christianity to be a 'declaration of science', he nevertheless proclaims that he has not embarked on a marriage with Jesus Christ

as father-in-law. God is what he said. He now recognizes that in trampling on Christianity he after all was innocent. He even says 'Let us not be dazzled by the extent of my innocence. He obeyed another law—that of the future. He had always been as pagan as Joan of Arc.'

Now there are many puzzling aspects in this confession of faith. The unsolved enigmas of the *Saison en Enfer* may be listed thus:

1. The affirmation that truth and light (or sanity) are two different things. That social truth is different from solitary truth.
2. The contradictory attitude to the Church and Christianity. This has been the source of the quarrels between the Marxists and the Catholics, the Gaucières and the Claudels of criticism.
3. The declaration that Joan of Arc, like Rimbaud, was a pagan.
4. The doctrine of 'Esprit' and number. Rimbaud declares that we are progressing to the age of spirit and number—what does he mean? And he contrasts that law of spirit with the law of the pagan.
5. In one of his relapses he speaks of his forgetfulness of history, of principles. Of what principles derived from history was he speaking?
6. Rimbaud says he knows the Europe of the Rights of Man and every 'fils de famille'. What does this phrase mean?
7. Why does Rimbaud head the chapter that deals with his temporary desire to revert to the Orient with the title 'L'Impossible'?

To all these problems the solution will be found in Michelet. Every one of my contentions will be found confirmed in Miss Starkie's admirable biography (Faber and Faber, 1938), but up till now these facts were unexplained, and the biographer herself frequently declares how puzzling she found them. For myself I did not pick out the facts from the biography and then seek a theory to fit them, but as a student of Rimbaud and Vico already in possession of my theory I found the wealth of facts accumulated in the two books, *Arthur Rimbaud* and *Arthur Rimbaud in Abyssina* (Clarendon Press, 1937), confirmed it. Thus it will come as news to most people occupied with Rimbaud that he was preoccupied with historical theory. But on p. 262 of Miss Starkie's biography we find the following:

Delahaye tells us that Rimbaud had spoken to him during the winter of 1872-3 of the new prose poems he was going to compose, not the short prose poems of the previous year, but poems on a grandiose scale, *something more vivid than Michelet* [*italics mine*]. The general title was to be *L'Histoire magnifique* and it was to open with scenes called *Photographies des Temps Passés*.

Rimbaud's philosophy is Viconianism as transmuted and partly contradicted in the volumes and prefaces of Michelet's *Histoire de France*. Michelet's first volumes of the *Histoire de France* are dominated by Viconianism, and for that reason are Christian. In the preface of 1869 he proclaimed Vico as his master, and in 1827 and 1835 published versions and comments on the Viconian 'new science'. The Viconian historical philosophy, which has exercised so much influence on philosophers of

various schools, is briefly this: There are three ages of man, the barbaric and poetic, the heroic and aristocratic, and finally the plebeian or egalitarian, when the plebs generalizes patrician privilege, and the law of abstract number and science is introduced. All civilizations show this evolution, but in Christian civilizations the law becomes explicit: the law of charity, which makes man in society not natural but metaphysical, and the law of equality as applied in the plebeian or democratic epoch. This as we see carries us a long way in the understanding of the paradoxical doctrine in the *Saison* of the difference between what is true for the solitary man and what he must accept as truth in society—the law of charity. And, advised by Michelet himself, Rimbaud, who sought truth,¹ probably read Michelet's version of the 'new science'. Of this there are indications. 'Fils de famille' [see No. 6 above] is a Viconian phrase employed by Rimbaud in an exactly Viconian sense. According to Vico the epoch of democracy was the epoch of the emancipation of the 'fils de famille' (cf. Michelet's version, *passim*), who were liberated from the *patria potestas* and freed by the declaration of individual rights by the state. Rimbaud's 'fils de famille' in conjunction with the *Déclaration des droits de l'homme* is inexplicable without this.

The vision of the march of nations at the end of the *Saison* is Viconian, and its phraseology reminiscent of Michelet's version. It comes as a surprise, obtruding on his personal problems. But all is clear when we realize the historical principles that were occupying his mind. He was using—and he had dropped a hint that he was using—historical principles to solve personal problems. The historic law that Vico thought he discovered gave to the Italian the same vision of the march of nations. As every society had the same evolution, Vico was moved to enthusiasm and exalted by the vision of the 'world of nations', the 'great city of the human race', the inevitable and pre-ordained march of society that he had discovered by his 'new science'. And in the same phrase is not Rimbaud speaking of the 'new wisdom'?

Another small feature traceable to the text of Vico in Michelet's version is Rimbaud's saying that because he behaved in a negroid manner and had negro tendencies he was a 'son of Cham'. According to Vico there are three families of the race of man descended from the sons of Noah, and Cham is the ancestor of the negroes. (This, however, is not

¹ Do not let us forget that Rimbaud *read* whatever was necessary to him at the time. At school in Charleville he had, without doubt, and perhaps through his master Izambard, got to know Michelet, with other Romantic masters; and in London, in the transition period, when he was seeking a new way, he had a card for the Reading Room of the British Museum.

absolutely *probat*, as if Rimbaud had read Ballanche, also a disciple of Vico, he would have got it there.)

All this is far from explaining the denunciation of Christianity and the severing of connexion with it in the *Saison*, and the extraordinary declaration that Joan of Arc was a pagan. And all this is far from explaining Rimbaud's ultimate justification of his own innocence.

Michelet once more is the explanation. The political vicissitudes and the movement of thought in France had not allowed that historian to remain the Viconian he was during the Restoration and in the first years of Louis Philippe. He did not repudiate his *Moyen Age* on which so much of his fame rested, but sought a way out by applying a new interpretation to the Viconian law of number and science as the third stage of humanity. In the later Michelet, the Michelet of the 1869 preface and the *Renaissance*, these became repaganized and the ultimate stage of humanity was *pagan* number and science, tempered only by the law of service learned from Christ. Michelet now substituted for Vico's three ages three ages of his own: the law and the prophets, the gospel, and the Spirit (Introduction to the *Renaissance*). This Spirit is identified with number and calculation (*ibid.*). 'Spirit' and 'Number' were thus adopted by Rimbaud, with possibly an echo of Plato's *Timaeus*, quoted by Vico (*vide* Michelet's version).

Thus Gallic paganism is justified in Michelet's later work, even as Rimbaud justifies it in himself. Joan of Arc was an example of nascent paganism, as her strength was drawn from the oaks haunted by the druid spirits (1869 preface). This disposes of our third enigma.

The contradictions and obscure references in the *Saison en Enfer* hence find their clue in the prefaces of Michelet or in Michelet's version of Vico's 'new science'. This also accounts for Rimbaud's attitude in his later life. He was now in possession of a philosophy which had saved him from madness, and which he was resolved to put into practice. He believed with Michelet that Christ, who was not a God, but a strong man, had emancipated humanity from a sensual hell by the law of service, now applied in modern science.

It was paganism but with a difference—all the difference between sensual lust and scientific labour. He also believed with Vico and Michelet that the ages of poetry, that is of sensual imagery, are those of the first stages of man, and that poetry is superseded by science. Thus he never ceases to proclaim his contempt for poetry. 'Merde pour la poésie' (to Beaudier in 1891, in Starkie, *Arthur Rimbaud*, p. 350. Cp. also Etiemble et Y. Gaucière, *Rimbaud*, Paris, Gallimard, p. 246). On the

other hand he wished to take up music and science. He endeavoured to study for the *baccalauréat ès sciences* with a view to entering the École Polytechnique (Starkie, p. 279). He also showed a sudden ambition to play the piano (*ibid.*), which his biographer finds equally inexplicable. But not to those who know the sources of Rimbaud's thought. In Vico there is the same conviction that music and harmony are the ultimate development of humanity, and that poetry, the art of sensual images, belongs to the savage stage. This conviction is strengthened in Vico by Plato, who, in the *Timæus*, developed this point of view, and as there are direct references to the *Timæus* in Vico (Michelet's version), Rimbaud probably also read it, and likewise was strengthened in this proverbial Platonic point of view. From the *Timæus* he probably went on to the *Republic*, with which it is intimately connected, and where there is the same insistence on the worthlessness of poetry and the importance of harmony and music.

Towards the year 1883 (Starkie, p. 298) Rimbaud had an ambition to have a son an engineer, 'a man rich and powerful through science'. He endeavoured to apply consistently the law of charity he had discovered. He showed an inexhaustible charity to natives and whites (Starkie, p. 328). Trained observers detected in the warp and woof of his actions a secret doctrine of which they had not the clue. The Catholic bishop of Harar says:

Certainement, tout en faisant le commerce et en parcourant les chemins raboteux des campagnes de Harar, [il] tenait son esprit lumineux bien au-dessus des préoccupations serviles, des articles de négoce. Sa tenue assez négligée, la sobriété de sa vie, sa charité envers les pauvres indigènes, montraient assez que M. Arthur Rimbaud ne poursuivait pas les célébrités de la richesse (Starkie, *Arthur Rimbaud in Abyssinia*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, p. 153. Cp. also *Arthur Rimbaud*, p. 328).

The French Ambassador Paul Lagarde says that the natives looked on him as acting under divine inspiration (*Arthur Rimbaud in Abyssinia*, p. 28) and that while earning a living (and what a living!) he was dreaming of things that the natives and Moslem chiefs in the entourage of the Ameer did not at all understand.

We have now seen what philosophy Rimbaud was putting into practice after his conversion from poetry, but the elucidation of sources is mere vanity if it does not contribute to the elucidation of the problems that attach themselves to the thought of an author. These sources certainly do.

They answer two questions: (1) the exact relation of Rimbaud to Christianity, about which there are contradictory statements in his work, and which has thus contributed to the controversies of Catholics and

Socialists about his work. That inconsistency is exactly modelled on that of Michelet in his contradictory relation to Vico, which Rimbaud was not in a position to elucidate, and which he adopted *en bloc*. (2) The nature—and perhaps the worth—of Rimbaud's conversion. This also has been a vexed question ever since Rimbaud began to trouble the world. We now know that it was a doctrinaire conversion, one of those *constructions* that are superimposed on a man's nature, and which are so often conditioned by social fear, as it was in his case. That may have been the reason why it yielded him, and us, so little satisfaction. The Rimbaud who moves the world, who has renewed religion and poetry by a doctrine and practice of poetry probably destined to influence more and more religion, philosophy and life, was not the Rimbaud of the conversion, but the instinctive Rimbaud, the poet who suffered in order to bring into the world a new theory and a new practice. This is the divine Rimbaud, while the other was only a philosopher, a theorist who towards the end of his martyred existence began to regret his theory (cf. Starkie, p. 333). His biographer, who has been blamed for seeing something spasmodic, artificial, hasty and bookish in the fits and starts of this second part of his life, with its sudden desire to become an explorer, to study science, or to play the piano, and its incapacity to stick at anything—its complaint of failure and its refusal to respond to the promise of success, to make the little extra effort that spells success (Starkie, p. 297), is unfortunately only too well justified. All these things are the signs of an existence out of joint, governed not by its own laws, but by a doctrinaire conviction. What irony that it is the Rimbaud that Rimbaud condemned in virtue of a historical philosophy who to-day is so much more significant, so much more consonant with science and psychology, than all the historical philosophers in the world!

MARGARET I. CLARKE.

GREENMOUNT, W. AUSTRALIA.

HERDER AND PASCAL

HERDER the Protestant divine and Pascal the Catholic layman were both outsiders. Each was in conflict with obtuse opponents. Each essayed the task of rectifying fundamental errors in man's religious attitude, in face of all the accumulated weight of contemporary academic theology. Each, despite much bitterness and recurring grief, was full, to the end of life, of an unfailing passion to enlighten humanity about itself and to prosper its faith. And each attained finally a degree of serenity in regard to his own destiny that gave to his death something that is usually discerned in the martyrdoms of saints. No portrait of Herder brings this out—'la sérénité native, caractère suprême et distinctif de sa pensée', in Quinet's words¹—so amply as that by Anton Graff; in more than one respect its features recall Domat's well-known sketch of Pascal—the open forehead, the sharp nose, the full lower lip, the tender sympathetic eyes. The similarity is the more striking, in that earlier portraits scarcely suggest it; yet Graff caught and recorded a major aspect of Herder's final spiritual structure. Few readers, further, can have failed to notice the allusion—deliberate, as it turns out²—in the title *Provinzialblätter an Prediger*. It comes as no surprise to learn of Herder's familiarity with his French predecessor and to observe the respect with which he is mentioned and quoted. Yet to be told, even on the authority of his widow, that Pascal, of all the writers he studied in the course of multifarious researches, held so high a place of honour as to be always on his writing desk, is indeed remarkable. We know that he did not esteem French literature unduly highly, yet the *Pensées* were among his favourite and constant reading. He mentioned Pascal in the same breath as Jakob Böhme;³ he apostrophized him as 'ein Riesenmann von Einbildung und Urteil'⁴ and extolled him as 'der Erhabenste der Prosaisten Frankreichs'.⁵ Where did the affinity between the two men lie?⁶

It is at once apparent that the answer to this centres in the two fundamental themes of the theory of knowledge and the defence of revealed religion. It does not mean that the two men were in agreement;

¹ H. Tronchon, *Le jeune Edgar Quinet*, Paris, 1937.

² Herder, *Werke*, hrsg. von B. Suphan, VII, p. viii.

³ *Werke*, VIII, p. 319.

⁴ *Ibidem*.

⁵ *Werke*, XXIII, p. 234.

⁶ H. Tronchon, 'Un écho de Pascal outre-Rhin' in Tronchon's *Études*, Paris, 1935, has already drawn attention to this affinity and assembled valuable data, to which the present article is indebted. On the other hand, R. Frank, *Herders Frankreich-Erlebnis*, Diss., Hamburg, 1933, is quite useless on this point.

Weimar has no claims to be equated with Port Royal. It does mean that on these two matters the observations of the Catholic apologist were such as to make a direct and fruitful appeal to his German Lutheran successor, who by temperament and training was a receptive and sympathetic reader. Pascal, it may be said from a somewhat different angle, acted as a kind of reagent, which, upon contact with Herder's thought, added just that necessary factor that brought about the crystallization, in significant and palpable, if far from shapely and stable form, of his maturing views upon God and man. It can scarcely be accidental that his polemical writings upon religion and philosophy followed upon the time of his greatest enthusiasm for Pascal. The reading of the *Pensées* must have fertilized and guided the growing convictions that came of his sea-journey, his study of Shakespeare, his absorption in the Bible and his friendship with the mystical Countess Maria of Schaumburg-Lippe.

The theory of knowledge and the defence of revealed religion are, as is evident at once to readers of Pascal, so closely allied as to be scarcely separable. They are seen to be equally allied in Herder's case. The comparison shows up very clearly the unity in Herder's many-sided thought. In the light of Pascal's careful reasoning it emerges as far less contradictory and disjointed than is generally assumed. Only, where Pascal, the man of science, argues, demonstrates and persuades, with sobriety and precision, Herder, the preacher and poet, asserts, dogmatizes, reiterates, expatiates and embellishes, with much imagery and obstinate, ill-tempered forcefulness of style. The exquisitely poised aphorisms of the one are matched by aggressive, even extravagant, tirades of the other. Comparison with Pascal enables us to fill in the gaps in Herder's imperfect arguments. For Pascal demonstrates, with implacable logic, what Herder merely felt and could not define. Studied in conjunction, the two writers reveal a remarkable kinship. If allowance is made for the 'bizarre'-ness and the strict Catholicism of Pascal, it seems as if one frequently comes upon familiar thoughts of Herder in the unfamiliar guise of a foreign tongue and cogent reasoning. Yet beside the fullness of Pascal's system, how restricted does Herder's religious range appear! Its expanse is the expanse of diffuseness, not of subject.

Herder appears to have been acquainted with Pascal since his youth.¹ He read him in the Amsterdam edition of 1692. The time of greatest attraction was undoubtedly the early 1770's. In the Weimar years, when Herder was less pugnacious, his sympathy seems to have declined. But the *Pensées* had done their work. In the Bückeburg writings, the most

¹ H. Tronchon, 'Un écho de Pascal outre-Rhin', pp. 5 ff.

decisive of all for Herder's spiritual growth, they are mentioned with the greatest respect and reverence. For Herder found in Pascal a mighty ally in his battle for the restoration of harmony between the world and the will of God, the loss of which he saw as the source of all the spiritual and cultural maladjustments of the century.

Both men wrote against rationalist scepticism. If Pascal's foes were Descartes and the University of Paris and Jesuit sophistry, Herder's were Spalding and Michaelis and the University of Gottingen (which refused him a chair unless he would consent to a test of his orthodoxy). All Herder's Bückeburg works are as aggressively anti-academic, anti-pedantic and anti-dogmatic as the *Provinciales*. Each man set himself the task of cleansing religion of the corrupting influence of scholastic thought and disengaging it from all the confusion brought into it by the verbiage of professional commentators.

Pascal was for Herder a second Hamann. In him he found once more what his teacher had stressed so relentlessly—that nature operates for reasons of which reason is unaware, and that feeling, intuition and faith are the only true sources of knowledge, as of religion. Here, then, was a statement of that new basis of knowledge for which Herder, following both Hamann and Kant, was searching. How revealing it must have been to read thoughts that were so constantly engaging him, presented so lucidly and impeccably! The heart, he could read, and read with joy, has its reasons that reason does not know; reason itself can demonstrate its own limitations; reason, so far from having absolute validity, may be used for any purpose at the desire of the will; nature always gives the lie to reason, even mathematics recognizing the existence of infinity, which is inconceivable by reason; the feelings, instincts, heart provide data that are vital and which reason distorts once it tries to explain them. Pascal, the scientist, relies upon observation and perception. His method presupposes nothing. It recognizes that things exist independently of their being understood and that they can only be apprehended by the senses or felt by faith. Two things alone instruct man concerning all his nature—instinct and experience. Reason builds upon the messages they provide.¹

La raison agit avec lenteur, et avec tant de vues, sur tant de principes, lesquels il faut qu'ils soient toujours présents, qu'à toute heure elle s'assoupit ou s'égare, manque d'avoir tous ses principes présents. Le sentiment n'agit pas ainsi: il agit en un instant, et toujours est prêt à agir. Il faut donc mettre notre foi dans le sentiment; autrement elle sera toujours vacillante....² Nous connaissons la vérité, non seulement par la

¹ *Pensées* (vols. XII–XIV of L. Brunschvicg's edition of Pascal's *Œuvres*, Paris, 1921–5), nos. 248, 272, 277, 278, 396.

² Op. cit. 252.

raison, mais encore par le cœur; c'est de cette dernière sorte que nous connaissons les premiers principes, et c'est en vain que le raisonnement qui n'y a point de part, essaye de les combattre. Les pyrrhoniens, qui n'ont que cela pour objet, y travaillent inutilement. Nous savons que nous ne rêvons point; quelque impuissance où nous soyons de le prouver par raison, cette impuissance ne conclut autre chose que la faiblesse de notre raison, mais non pas l'incertitude de toutes nos connaissances, comme ils le prétendent. Car la connaissance des premiers principes, comme qu'il y a espace, temps, mouvement, nombres, (est) aussi ferme qu'aucune de celles que nos raisonnements nous donnent. Et c'est sur ces connaissances du cœur et de l'instinct qu'il faut que la raison s'appuie, et qu'elle y fonde tout son discours.¹

One who had been brought up in the school of Hume, of Kant and of Hamann could scarcely fail to welcome such findings. They contain the theme of all Herder's writings generally and of *Vom Erkennen und Empfinden* in particular. 'Wurde der Kopf denken, wenn dein Herz nicht schlug?'² is reminiscent of the content of these thoughts, as of Hamann's 'Optimus Maximus verlangt von uns keine Kopfschmerzen, sondern Pulsschläge'. It is not surprising to find Pascal's distinction between 'esprit de finesse' and 'esprit de géométrie' quoted at the head of the 1775 version of this treatise, and his imaginations referred to in connexion with the idea that visions and dreams and imaginations are themselves sources of knowledge.³

For both men the way to God lies through the senses, and the source of all knowledge is God. 'Die Seele spinnet, weiß, erkennt nichts aus sich, sondern was ihr von innen und außen ihr Weltall zuströmt, und der Finger Gottes zuwinket.'⁴ The senses perceive what God makes manifest. Revelation is the beginning of all knowledge. If God did not tell us, we should not know what it is essential for us to know. Without God's guidance we are utterly helpless to know anything. To the heart that believes and the senses that are attuned may be given the explanation that is necessary for our existence. 'Die ganze Religion in Grund und Wesen ist Tatsache! Geschichte! Auf Zeugnis der Sinne und nicht der Oberkräfte allein: bei dem Empfangenden auf Glaube, der alle Kräfte fasset, gebaut',⁵ wrote Herder in the *Provinzialblätter* (1775), about the same time as Goethe's 'Nenn's Gluck! Herz! Liebe! Gott! Ich habe keinen Namen/Dafür! Gefühl ist alles;/Name ist Schall und Rauch,/Umnebelnd Himmelsglut.' It is strange to link Pascal with the Sturm und Drang, but the affinity is inescapable!

Herder had learnt by hard experience to believe in revelation as a central factor in life. His shipwreck effected a 'conversion' that is easily comparable to Pascal's. This he expressed in a memorable passage:

Hast du je bei kalten dunklen Nächten, nach einer gefährlichen, grauen- und schauervollen Mitternacht... auf den ersten Stral der Morgenrote gehofft, und dann

¹ Op. cit. 282.

⁴ Op. cit., VIII, p. 194.

¹ Werke, VIII, p. 201.

⁵ Op. cit., VI, p. 265

³ Op. cit., VIII, p. 189.

den webenden Geist der Tagesfrühe gefühlt, wie er sich von dem erwachenden Morgen, ein Hauch Gottes! ein Geist des Himmels niedersenkt und auf den Fluten wandelt! und wie er alles durchschauert. . . . Und siehe! diese Entzückung, dies unnennbare Morgengefühl, wies scheint alle Wesen zu ergreifen! zu liegen auf der ganzen Natur! Alles lag in Nacht und Dunkel: der webende Geist kam und bereitet was zu erharren. . . . wehe dem Fühllosen, der diese Szene gesehen und Gott nicht gefühlt hat!¹

And following upon the stupendous impressions of that grey and stormy dawn, he found, in the unhappy isolation of life in Buckeburg, his main and almost only solace in the Bible. Like Pascal he found rationalist theology to be meaningless in face of his own experience. He sought for the real essence of religion in the teeth of false worldliness and cramping dogmatism. It had always been his method to go back to first principles and now he accepted God as the first principle of all and regarded revelation as a fact of incontrovertible reality. Religious truth is thus, for both men, a matter of history—it consists in revelation, revelation through the World ('Im Anfang war die Tat!') and through the Word. Both seek to obtain from history a result that transcends all history, to discover from the past a statement of the future, to read from God's own intervention the mystery that encompasses all human life. History provided the substance, the Bible the explanation (and in Pascal's case this was supplemented by the accumulated evidence of the Church). The Bible alone tells that man is not the hopeless creature he appears to be; it alone records data that testify to superhuman inspiration. No writings can approach the antiquity of the books of Moses,² which are almost contemporary with the events they relate. There is much that is clearly akin to the *Älteste Urkunde des Menschengeschlechts* (1774–6) here. As Herder's was to be, Pascal's approach to religion was historical.

According to Pascal the truth is known to two classes of people—to the very simple, who act without understanding, those (as Herder would have said) who are creatures of unconscious impulse and spontaneity, naïve, unspoilt 'Naturmenschen', and to the perfect Christians who have understood that it is not necessary to understand and who rely wholly upon faith. There was good reason for Herder's demanding a revival of that naturalness and piety, of feeling and single-hearted devoutness that he believed was characteristic of the Middle Ages! To see God's purpose behind all things—'der Gang Gottes in der Natur'—was, for him, the source of all wisdom and understanding, and this was essentially an act of faith. For, as Pascal said, if God exists, He must be incomprehensible, otherwise He would not be God. And surely this is what is implied in

¹ Op. cit., VI, pp. 136–7.

² Pascal, *Œuvres*, ed. Brunschvicg, XII, pp. cclxviii ff., *Pensée* 601.

Herder's Buckeburg philosophy of history—that God is above our comprehension, it is sufficient to recognize this; and that the mystery of man's destiny can only be fully known at the end. Is not this what history and the Bible taught Herder—to say, with Socrates-Hamann, that all that we know is that we know and can know nothing, and that we must supplement our ignorance and consequent helplessness with humble belief?

The theological foundation of Herder's historiography is amply brought out by the comparison with Pascal. In particular it is made clear that there never was any need to characterize him as a pantheist, any more than Pascal was a pantheist. There is nothing in *Auch Eine Philosophie* or any other of the Buckeburg writings to suggest that he was such; in fact all things point to his belief in transcendentalism. What is true is what is true of Pascal—that he made use of the method of immanence without adopting the doctrine of immanence.¹ That is why he turns to the Bible, to God, for knowledge of man. For nature may indeed be a living symbol, the outward manifestation, the 'living garment' of God, but only a manifestation, only the garment. God is something that is above nature, an all-sustaining, all-encompassing, inscrutable Creator. Nature and God are not co-extensive. It is true that in the *Ideen*, later, man appears to have taken the place of God as the centre of things in Herder's scheme; but that is only apparent; we are misled by Herder's carelessness in apportioning emphasis. When we read all his philosophy and theology together we cannot escape the central idea of the Kingdom of God, the hereafter, for which all things are in the nature of preparations, and Our Lord the perfect guide.

Herder went beyond Pascal, in that he did not share his view that man is not inherently good. As a part of nature, the manifestation of God, man could hardly be any other than a receptacle of the divine, and the possessor of an innate tendency towards good. And it is here, no doubt, that may be found the source of Herder's disharmony of outlook. He could not throw overboard this thought and be single-heartedly orthodox, nor could he discard orthodoxy and become a thoroughgoing pantheist—to the eternal detriment of his peace of mind. There are times when he seems to be inclining first in one direction and then in the other, but never permanently. His philosophy of history is as revealing as his theological writings. He was for ever conscious of the lack of conformity, on the

¹ J. Chevalier, *Pascal*, Paris, 1922, pp. 203 f. and p. 340, is particularly valuable in bringing out this most important point, which appears to have escaped other interpreters of Pascal.

part of his own age, with the will of God, and for ever stressing how submission of the self to God's will would resolve all difficulties. If in fact Herder were a pantheist, it is hard to see how he could have explained why his own age could alone stand so lamentably apart from all others. He was never a logician, but he cannot have been so blind as to fail to note this. The belief, so constantly stated, that Herder was a pantheist, has caused endless trouble. It is unfair, moreover, to him, for if we admit it, we are led to accuse him of more inconsistencies than he merits. It has already been shown¹ that what has been regarded as pantheism may better be regarded as a relic of medieval scholasticism. And it is difficult to believe how, even in eighteenth-century Germany, a man so seemingly unorthodox as some modern interpreters have implied could have been considered, much less accepted, for high pastoral posts. Particularly revealing is his candidature for a chair at Gottingen, where a great effort was made to secure him on two occasions for a notoriously exacting Faculty—the formalities required the first time should certainly not be taken as proof of his unorthodoxy, and the second attempt was made shortly after the publication of his supposedly Spinozistic *Gott* (1787)! Spinoza, indeed, provided only the outer framework, and if Herder equated the Christian God and Spinoza's God, as has been asserted,² it can only be because he was not clear as to what pantheism really was. Herder was not unorthodox, but he was orthodox *plus* something else—namely the dynamic philosophy of Leibniz. When Pascal declares that we should not seek God if we did not already possess Him, he says as much and no more than Herder and he is being no more pantheistic than Herder was.³

The sombre fury of *Auch Eine Philosophie* and other Bückeburg writings accords closely with the tone of the *Pensées*. Both men, who could see God everywhere, were distressed that others could not, or would not. They, who strove to see how far man can and does fulfil divine intentions, who set the Bible in the forefront of everything, fought all the harder to make its message clear. Herder, as Pascal, adopted the historical approach to religion, piercing back to the earliest beginnings, the first revelation, the oldest document of mankind, to seek out the hidden truth, to read the mysterious cypher that is the Old Testament.⁴

¹ E. W. Strothmann, 'Das scholastische Erbe im Herderschen "Pantheismus"', *Dichtung und Volkstum*, xxxvii (1936), pp. 174 ff.

² R. Haym, *Herder*, II, Berlin, 1885, p. 278.

³ *Pensée* 555. Cf. also Filleau de la Chaise, *Discours*, in Brunsvicg's edition of the *Œuvres*, xii, p. ccii, and H. F. Stewart, *The Holiness of Pascal*, Cambridge, 1915, p. 90, in addition to J. Chevalier, loc. cit.

⁴ *Pensées* 681, 691.

In the light of Pascal Herder's progress becomes much easier to follow. From the purely aesthetic approach to the Bible, of 1769-70, he moved to a religious, even mystical one—a change which the reading of Pascal may have assisted or accelerated, or even, in conjunction with his shipwreck and the solitary communings of Buckeburg, engendered.¹ Then came the effort to discover, from revelation, the necessary key to the mystery of human development, followed by the sharp polemic against contemporary civilization for its deviation from the will of God, contained in a survey of history in which Pascal's comparison of progress to the life of an individual recurs. And then, when the emphasis had been somewhat shifted, the *Ideen* sought to observe the world as the fulfilment of God, rather than to condemn its local or contemporary aberrations, as *Auch Eine Philosophie* had done.

There is much in Pascal that is completely foreign to Herder. And even the similarities must not be overstressed. The value of the comparison, to us as well no doubt as to Herder himself, lies in the degree of cohesion and continuity that it enables Herder's thought to assume. Pascal, as it were, presents Herder's case for him. He must have helped incalculably by giving precision and plasticity to indistinct feelings and forebodings that were in Herder's mind, and thus contributed strongly to the—still remarkable—change that his thought underwent after the sea-journey. He performs the same office to those who would interpret Herder, bringing some sort of shape and form into the most amorphous and elusive, but none the less significant, of writings.

A. GILLIES.

HULL.

¹ Cf. the present author's 'Herder's Approach to the Philosophy of History', *Modern Language Review*, xxxv (1940), pp. 193 ff. It may be noted, finally, that *Pensée* 5 on the subject of time may well have a bearing on Herder's comments upon the unity of time in the essay on Shakespeare. Cf also *Modern Language Review*, xxxvi (1941), p. 398.

ALTERNATION OF PERSONALITY IN THE DRAMAS OF HEINRICH VON KLEIST AND ZACHARIAS WERNER

THE abnormality of Kleist's characters disturbs the reader; Penthesilea and Homburg seem to have so little in common with ordinary humanity that they would forfeit the claims of drama to present real life in a heightened form. For while even the monsters or eccentrics of Shakespeare's tragedy—Richard III or Hamlet—are doubtless outside the spectator's private experience, they appeal to his sense of probability; so that these imaginary personages add to his understanding of human nature at least as much as familiarity with real people might do. Superficially, this convincing realism is lacking in Kleist's characterization: Homburg—distract and irresolute to the point of feeble-mindedness—appears as remote from the average person's life as is the maniacal Penthesilea, who tears her lover into shreds, with frantic hands and teeth.

Yet Kleist did not, apparently, intend his characters to be phantasms, divorced from reality: his celebrated apologia for *Penthesilea*, in the dedicatory letter to Goethe of 24 January 1808, touches on precisely this point, when he wishes that the august reader might accept the play as 'possible', and concede the ghastly dénouement as a logical conclusion to these premises.¹ Why then did Kleist project what he meant to be a realistic picture of man's conflicts into the distorting mirror of insanity, or remarkable neurotic conditions?

The clue to this problem doubtless lies in the obsessive mode for 'unconscious' psychology in Kleist's day, which exerted its enchantment over him too. As one reads the popular exposition of this strangely appropriate 'romantic' science of the mind in the works of G. H. Schubert, one should not forget that within the imaginative embroidery of its presentation there lurk the initial principles of our modern psychological outlook, based on an assumption that the neurasthenic, or even the madman, is not cut off from the common lot of mankind, as a freakish outcast, but may be inspired in his extravagances by impulses that are common to sane and insane alike, but are latent in the first, and freed in the second.

¹ 'So, wie es hier steht, wird man vielleicht die Prämissen, als möglich, zugeben müssen, und nachher nicht erschrecken, wenn die Folgerung gezogen wird' (Kleist, *Sämtliche Werke*, edited W. Herzog, Leipzig, 1909-11, VI, p. 378).

That madness (like dreams, and similar states, in which the conscious mind loses its control over our thoughts and actions) does not create an entirely new series of mental processes unrelated to those of sanity (or consciousness), but rather reveals obscure potentialities, was a thesis accepted by Mesmer's disciples, the German practising psychotherapists of the romantic age, and Kleist reproduced their picture of the unconscious or semi-conscious states freeing hidden emotional forces in his representation of neurasthenics or somnambulists. He was the literary innovator who created a new kind of dramatic hero, one who reveals in an exaggerated form the sombre implications of our complex psychological mechanism. There is, surely, as much truth in the 'super-realism' of his projection of normally latent involuntary instincts, as there is in the 'super-idealism' of the classicist vision of triumphant conscious will.

The form in which Kleist shows this display of involuntary impulses is essentially dramatic, for he throws them into violent contrast to the thoughts and actions of normal consciousness, and plays off against each other the two 'selves' that appear alternately in the isolated twin halves of the character's cleft consciousness. The conscious and unconscious 'selves' are in this way regarded as warring *Doppelgänger*¹ within the complex mind.

This conflict between alternating parts of the personality is represented in its most remarkable form in *Penthesilea*. The heroine of the play is described as having been originally of a gentle disposition, a model of maidenly virtues:

So sittsam!
In jeder Kunst der Hände so geschickt!
So reizend, wenn sie tanzte, wenn sie sang!
So voll Verstand und Wurd und Grazie!

Sie war wie von der Nachtigall geboren... (Sc. xxiii).

But the destiny that imposes the duties of an Amazonian queen upon her introduces into her nature elements incompatible with her natural characteristics. As she is forced to assume a new and implacable severity, and even ferocity, so her habitual way of thinking, her true self, is suppressed, or at least pushed away out of sight. Suddenly the precarious domination of the newly acquired disposition is shaken; an overwhelming emotional crisis frees her natural self from the oblivion in which it has slumbered, and at the first sight of Achilles she stands as if paralysed by the violence of her love. But the reaction of the secondary,

¹ I propose to deal in a later work with the *Doppelgänger*, and its relationship with dissociation of personality.

Amazonian self is correspondingly violent when she once more obeys the promptings of her will-power; rage and shame at her weakness increase the effect of the emotional crisis; and her personality, already split by the conflicting elements, now disintegrates into two dissociated entities. The natural emotions she has hitherto suppressed are exacerbated to a pitch of violence that threatens to destroy the balance of her conscious mind; and the presence of this dimly felt emotional energy poisons her rational consciousness with a menacing sense of inward disunity and accentuates her determination to avenge this involuntary weakness. The repeated frustration of the obsession drives her into a frenzy, which reaches its first climax when she is defeated in battle, and with her last strength breathes out threats and hatred against the victorious Achilles, whose body she yearns to see mown down by the scythed axles of her battle-cars (Sc. ix). Then she sinks into a trance-like state of indifference, from which she awakens with an exaggerated form of her normal personality in possession of her mind; she desires only to be humiliated and tortured by her lover, with a morbid self-abasement that forms the evident complement to her previous ferocity:

Lasst ihn mit Pferden hauptlings heim mich schleifen,
 Staub lieber, als ein Weib sein, das nicht reizt (Sc. ix).

A curious situation ensues (Sec. xiv, xv), in which Achilles appears as conqueror, but (acceding to her whim that she must take him prisoner, if he is to be her lover) he pretends that the position is reversed, and that he has been captured. In the blurred state of consciousness into which her exhaustion has thrown her, she accepts the deception, and at last the obsessing demands of her Amazonian personality seem to be reconciled with the unconscious promptings of her natural self, and the bitter conflict of the two selves ceases: 'Die Eumeniden fliehn, die schrecklichen...' When she is rescued from her disguised captivity she is infuriated with her rescuers; but learns the truth from them. The blow is too overwhelming for her distressed mind; at the very moment in which she imagined she had silenced the warring voices within, and achieved her greatest desire, she is thwarted. Her mind is chaotic as the erotic obsession of her unconscious emotions is freed by this 'psychological hammer-blow', to surge forward, together with her Amazonian lust for vengeance; the formidable combination of involuntary impulse and conscious intention joins all that is evil in both her selves, and in the maniacal fury that bridges conscious and unconscious states she hurries into battle, insensible to reason. In this delirium she wounds the un-

resisting Achilles (who had not foreseen the revulsion of feeling) and joins with her dogs in tearing him limb from limb. Then, exhausted, she sinks once more into a trance, from which she awakens in her normal state of mind, and with no recollection of the deeds she has just performed. When she is told what she has done, and with difficulty convinces herself that it is true, she kills herself in remorse for what seems to be the work of an entirely different person, so foreign is it to her normal character, and inclinations.

This appalling conclusion is only the logical result of the initial split between Penthesilea's two selves, aggravated by the emotional crisis of her love for Achilles, in conflict with her voluntary principles.¹ Yet various features of Penthesilea's dissociation of personality call for comment; it is, for instance, particularly significant that the alternation of selves is preceded in each case by a trance. The doctors who had experimented with Mesmer's theories of animal magnetism as a psychotherapeutic method had already, at the time when Kleist wrote his dramas, observed and recorded cases of divided personality in which the trance played a similar part, as an intermediary state. In *Die Symbolik des Traumes*, G. H. Schubert quotes from the standard works on magnetism available to him²—not all of which could be accessible to Kleist, but which correspond to the theories of magnetic phenomena generally held at the period. He mentions women whose lives were divided into separate, alternating parts, with completely different characteristics; and who offer an interesting parallel to Penthesilea; for of one he says that her friends thought she must have two souls, making alternating appearances.³ Such cases Schubert terms 'doppelte Persönlichkeit'; and he points out that the two divided personalities are not even linked by memory; like Penthesilea, the cases he cites show no recollection of what has occurred during the emergence of the other self, and in this circumstance they differ from 'magnetized' (that is, hypnotized) subjects, who recall the obscurest events of their normal consciousness when they are in their magnetic sleep. The first of the two divided personalities continues its active existence at the point at which it left off at the end of its last appearance, before being interrupted by the substitution of the second personality; and the same is true of the second personality:

¹ Cf. Kleist's letter to Goethe, quoted above.

² He mentions Gmelin (the pioneer among Mesmer's German disciples, from 1785 onwards), Kluge's *Versuch einer Darstellung des animalischen Magnetismus als Heilmittel* (1811), and Reil's *Rhapsodien über die Anwendung der psychischen Kurmethode auf Geisteszerstörung* (1803). Cf. Paul Sucher, *Les sources du merveilleux chez E. T. A. Hoffmann*, Paris, 1912, p. 14.

³ Schubert, *Symbolik des Traumes*, Bamberg, 1814, p. 109.

‘Beyde Zustände waren daher in sich selber zusammenhängend, jeder einzelne aber mit dem andern ausser Zusammenhang’.¹

It is the complete isolation of these dissociated selves that attracts Schubert’s attention; he cites numerous analogous instances of the states of consciousness which are joined together by no communicating channel of memory: they may occur in somnambulism, convalescence, madness, and the dream; and the patient will have no recollection of having revealed a contrasting personality to his normal, waking self: ‘Sie sind und glauben sich im Anfall eine ganz andere Person als im Wachen und umgekehrt.’²

The contrast between the two personalities reveals itself in the hatred which somnambulist and magnetic subjects reveal for their dearest friends; Schubert quotes a sensational case from Reil, in which a pregnant woman was seized by the violent desire to slay her husband (whom she loved dearly) and eat his flesh.³ The reason for such a revulsion of feeling as this, or Penthesilea’s, would be (according to Schubert) that the emotions, freed from the suppressed state in which civilized man keeps them normally, are ambiguous in their expression; they are frequently bound up with their reverse impulse, and, in particular, violent sexual inclination is closely allied to cruelty and murderous desires—‘die schon längst anerkannte Verwandtschaft der Wollust (Fleischeslust) und Mordlust’.⁴

In this way the alternation of Penthesilea’s rival personalities forms the substance of the drama’s tragic conflict; and the result of the struggle determines the fatal outcome of the play. In the heroine of *Das Käthchen von Heilbronn*, on the other hand, the alternation of selves is not regarded as the active force determining her fate and that of the surrounding people, but as the result of the force imposed from without. Kleist himself regarded her as a passive counterpart to Penthesilea: ‘die Kehrseite der Penthesilea, ihr andrer Pol, ein Wesen, das ebenso mächtig ist durch gänzliche Hingebung, als jene durch Handeln’;⁵ and elsewhere he describes her as a negative version of the Amazon Queen: ‘sie gehören ja wie das + und – der Algebra zusammen, und sind Ein und dasselbe Wesen, nur unter entgegengesetzten Beziehungen gedacht’.⁶ Characteristic of the respective natures of these spiritual *Doppelgänger* is the distinctive reaction of each to the initial crisis that frees the unconscious

¹ Op cit., p. 110.

² Op cit., pp. 110–11.

³ Op. cit., p. 122.

⁴ Op cit., p. 125.

⁵ Letter to a friend (? Henriette Hendel-Schütz) at the close of 1807 (Kleist, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. cit., vi, p. 365).

⁶ Letter to Collin, 8 Dec. 1808 (*Werke*, vi, p. 392).

self. The first, paralysing effect of the very sight of Achilles on Penthesilea gives place to a furious revulsion as her secondary, and ferocious, personality reasserts itself; Kathchen is, on the contrary, cast into a trance-like state of complete dependence on Wetter vom Strahl when she first sees him, and her secondary self is like that imposed by a hypnotist on the magnetic subject. It seems probable that Kleist actually intended her dog-like devotion to Wetter to be considered exclusively as the result of a magnetic relationship, exerted unconsciously by Wetter. Magnetic influence is exercised, not by the brain (the centre of normal consciousness, according to the opinions of Kleist's age), but by the rival forces of the 'ganglionic system', comprising the 'lower' and involuntary organs (which control the unconscious mind, and are the seat of the emotions). Wetter is naturally unconscious of his involuntary love for Kathchen, and of their magnetic affinity; and the gradual emergence of this fact from the unconscious, until it becomes accessible to his rational mind, shows the essential development of the dramatic action; for here again there is conflict between the two inward selves. As in *Penthesilea*, the self of the normal consciousness resists the invasion of an emotional reaction offensive to rational prejudices—Wetter's considerations of rank form the counterpart to Penthesilea's Amazonian pretensions—while his unconscious self eagerly tries to divulge the presence of an emotional crisis to the unwilling reason. The process takes place gradually; with instinctive apprehension Wetter checks his vague awareness of the affection for Kathchen; and when the emotional disorder forces its presence upon him, he desperately misinterprets the ambiguous promptings of the senses to threaten and ill-treat her. Kathchen, for her part, is undisturbed by his brutality, for her unconscious self is now uppermost in her mind, freed from the fetters of reason by the emotional crisis that overwhelmed her when she first saw him, this self is sensitive to the message of her senses so that she is fully aware of the magnetic correspondence binding them together. Wetter finally becomes conscious of his involuntary love only by interrogating Kathchen as she lies in the curious state of apparent sleep in which magnetic subjects are still aware of everything the hypnotist does and says. Her replies force him to recognize as the truth the fact that they have been in magnetic sympathy for some time, and had met telepathically before their first actual encounter in Heilbronn. This coincidence of dreams is not a purely fantastic invention, like many incidents in the play. Apart from the incongruous cherubim, the circumstances of the meeting seem to be in keeping with the accepted potentialities of animal magnetism, which was supposed to bridge

physical division, since the 'lower' organs, that assume control over the mind and body during the magnetic trance, are not affected by distance.¹

The analogous state of somnambulism is dealt with in a third drama, the *Prinz von Homburg*. In the trance-like state in which the hero is discovered at the opening of the play, the emotional reactions of his unconscious mind are revealed, which have not been accessible to his waking consciousness. Like Käthchen, he observes what takes place around him, even though he is apparently asleep, and he recognizes Natalie, when she approaches him, as the object of his unconscious love; but when he awakens from his trance, he has only vague recollections of the revelations of his secondary self, and identifies Natalie by chance as the lady of his 'vision' by the external evidence of her glove, which he has snatched from her hand while he was in his trance. In that state he has shown the symptoms to which Schubert refers in his remarks on magnetism:—'jene [Eigenschaften]...welche man einem geschärften Gemeingefühl zuschreibt, und welche ausserdem auch zum Theil bey Nachtwandlern gefunden wird, die Eigenschaft äussere Gegenstände zu bemerken, ohne sie zu sehen'.²

Homburg's somnambulistie dissociation of personality differs from Penthesilea's alternation of selves in that the two parts of his personality are not sharply divided from one another; and his normal consciousness is still blurred by traces of the events of the trance. But, as in Penthesilea's case, the unconscious part of his mind (which emerged during the trance) dominates even his consciousness, and creates a chaotic mental state in which the obscurest impulses make their appearance. The Elector's death-sentence is the psychological hammer-blow, corresponding to the frustration of Penthesilea's self-imposed purpose, that completes the disintegration of the personality. Placed in the same urgent dilemma between life and dishonour as Shakespeare's Claudio, in *Measure for Measure*, Homburg is in a mental situation between dreaming and waking; and in a hopeless confusion of voluntary and involuntary impulses, he gives way to irrational and cowardly terror, of which, no doubt, he is as blameless as Penthesilea or Käthchen are of their respective crimes and follies. But it is, of course, debatable whether a dramatic hero is permitted these deviations from the rules of heroic behaviour; and spite of the arguments of Tieck, Kleist's first editor, and apologist,

¹ Cf. Schubert, *Symbolik*, pp. 133-6; also his *Ansichten von der Nachtseite der Naturwissenschaft*, Dresden, 1808, pp. 344-50.

Schubert, *Ansichten*, p. 337.

Grillparzer for one considered it a grave technical fault that Homburg should be the toy of uncontrollable and irrational impulses.¹

But though Kleist abandoned the traditions of heroic conduct, Schubert's *Symbolik* shows how faithfully he followed the general theories of contemporary psychiatry in these three dramas, which resolve themselves, in fact, into dramatic expositions of Schubert's hypothesis of the dual control of the mind; the villain of the piece is the evil 'shadow-self', and dramatic conflict arises from the incompatibility between this and the reasonable, waking self. Torn between the rival tyrannies of the 'outer' and 'inner' natures, man is brought all too often to a bad end: '...in der unselig-seligen Mitte schwebt der Mensch, gerissen nach zwey Seiten, öfters von dem widerspänstigen Gespann zerrissen...' ²

Kleist was not alone in his age as the poet of the alternating personalities, for examples of the same phenomenon may be found in Zacharias Werner's plays, though they are not treated in the same realistic spirit. The resemblance between the situation in *Penthesilea* and that of Werner's *Wanda, Königin der Sarmaten*, written in the same years, is so striking that Werner might appear superficially to contest Kleist's title as pioneer in the literary presentation of the unconscious personality. In *Wanda*, as in *Penthesilea*, the successively predominant selves are governed by the ambiguous merging of love and cruelty, and similar events cause their alternation. Once again, a warlike queen is shown torn between the seemingly incompatible claims of inclination and duty; and, face to face with the beloved antagonist, she finds the conflict resolving itself into an actual struggle to the death. The concupiscence and the blood-lust that at first appear as the expression of the warring voluntary and involuntary principles prove to be related by a close affinity; but it now becomes clear that Werner approaches the theme in a different way to Kleist, his purpose is not to depict with psychological realism the violent emotional dualism of human nature, after the style of his own inward disharmony, but to follow the irrelevant principles of his own private philosophy of love—a mystical variation on the Platonic theme of twin souls, and regarding death as the gateway to the eventual reunion of the divided halves.³

Wanda and *Rüdiger* are both true to this guiding conception when they alternately worship and hate, attack and spare, each other; for their love can find no real consummation in life, but only in death. *Wanda's* change

¹ See Foglar, *Grillparzers Ansichten über Literatur, Bühne und Leben*, Vienna, 1872, p. 17 (quoted in Herzog's edition of Kleist's works, III, p. 515).

² Schubert, *Symbolik*, p. 70.

³ See *Wanda*, Act IV.

from fury to amorous despair in the process of the struggle is not the result of the alternation of dissociated parts of her personality, inaccessible to one another (as in Penthesilea's case); for her ferocity is essentially one with her love, and not an alternative, though related, phenomenon. It expresses itself in the masochistic desire of both the protagonists to suffer 'sweet death' from the hand of the beloved, not to sate themselves, like Penthesilea, in an orgy of sadistic fury, when the evil, and ambiguous, impulses are released from the unconscious. The necessity—ordained by the inexorable fate of romantic tragedy—that Wanda should slay her lover, she realizes slowly but with comparative calm; for she regards the deed as a ceremonial sacrifice to their love; and only after she has made her decision does she work herself into a fury, and stab him: for which he thanks her with his last breath. Nor is her subsequent suicide determined by remorse for a deed performed under the influence of the other self; her death is the natural complement to her deliberately planned and executed 'sacrifice', and only in the moment when she springs into the Vistula before the eyes of her assembled people does her 'amorous madness' reawaken momentarily in the delirious mood of the execution of a decision already taken. She has now accomplished the last preliminary to the consummation of her love, and her death opens the way to a blissful reunion with her lover; whereas Penthesilea destroyed herself in despair, as the hopeless victim of a savage fate dwelling within her divided nature, which denied her the fulfilment of her love and for her there was no hereafter.

Another of Werner's plays, also exactly contemporary with *Penthesilea*, is *Attila, König der Hunnen* (1808), which offers another remarkable parallel to Kleist's representation of the alternation of personality, though again it translates the psychological realism of the process into terms of the author's private superstition. If Wanda hovers between love and hate of the beloved enemy, only to find a solution which providently affords the satisfaction of duty and inclination alike, Hildegunde's inward division is caused by a spirit of revenge that enslaves her to obscure powers of evil, and possesses her mind like an unclean spirit. It is suggested that, like Penthesilea, she has been forced to suppress her true womanly nature, and substitute a second and unnatural self, which makes of her a 'fury'—'frightful but calm'—for she is bent only on avenging the deaths at Attila's hands of her father and her lover. Werner is true to his prescribed methods when he describes Hildegunde's subservience to the demons of revenge quite unrealistically as an instance of diabolic possession; and twice the indwelling fiend is exorcized by Leo, the saintly

bishop of Rome. On the first occasion the result is spectacular, though only temporary; for at the sight of the chalice which the bishop extends towards her she falls in convulsions to the ground, while the imprisoned demon clamours for freedom from her tormented body (iv. 3). She becomes unconscious, until the bishop lays his hand on her forehead and bids the 'spirit of night' to depart; then she awakens, freed from this demon of revenge, and for the first time she acknowledges to Attila (though unheeded) her plot against him. There follows a period of inward peace and remorse, that resembles Penthesilea's brief return to serenity of mind, before her last, and fatal, outburst: Hildegunde sinks exhausted into a deep sleep, from which she regains consciousness, still freed from the possessing fiend, though in her sleep she has been distracted by the rival factions in her mind (v, 1). But the sight of the fatal axe with which her lover had been killed reawakens the fiend, whose power reveals itself in the sombre glitter of her eyes, and she reverts to her 'possessed', or secondary, personality (v, 1). The same axe is used to slay Attila's son, then Attila himself, on their wedding night; but though Hildegunde is now irrevocably consigned to damnation for her crimes, she is freed by Leo's second exorcism in the last moments of her life from the possessing demon, and dies in comparative peace of mind.

By his deliberately unrealistic treatment of an almost identical situation to that in Kleist's *Penthesilea*, Werner confirms (by contrast) Kleist's inclination towards extreme realism. Werner, in his picture of the conflict of emotions leading up to Wanda's, and Hildegunde's 'Liebestod', uses the same apparatus of alternating love and hate, bridged only by mysterious trances, as that with which Kleist traces the ultimate potentialities of Penthesilea's inward dualism. But in Werner's hands this datum, which might have been culled from a contemporary psychotherapist's case-book, emphasizes the wholly allegorical nature of the 'gospel' of love and death it encloses, which is based on an ideal conception remote from the experiences of ordinary life. Kleist, on the other hand, uses the phenomena of neurasthenia or madness with confidence in the underlying validity of their exposure of the obscure parts of man's nature.

The accusation that the dramatist creates characters irrelevant to normal humanity is one which Werner invites; but when it is levelled against Kleist it is based on a grave misinterpretation of his poetic intentions, even if the authenticity of his 'super-realistic' view of the night-side of human nature rests merely on a psychologist's hypothesis.

RALPH TYMMS.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

A FRAGMENT OF THE OLD FRENCH ROMANCE 'PARIS ET VIENNE'

In the September 1927 issue of the *M.H.R.A.*, the Rev. H. J. Chaytor described three fragments of manuscripts in the possession of Sir Sydney Cockerell, publishing one of them, the *Florence de Rome* fragment; and Professor Baker published the second fragment, from the *Evangelies des Domees*, in the following issue.

The third fragment is a leaf from a fifteenth-century prose romance; the writer is indebted to Sir Sydney for the indication that this romance is the *Paris et Vienne* of Pierre de la Cypède.¹ This is a translation into French out of the Provençal, the translation dating from about the year 1432; no Provençal version, however, is known, the earliest manuscript being a fragment at Carpentras, dated 1438. Six other manuscripts exist, the best, Bibliothèque Nationale MS. Fr. 1480, having been published by Dr Robert Kaltenbacher in *Romanische Forschungen* (xv, 1904, pp. 321-688 z), together with variants from the other manuscripts. In this edition there is a full bibliography of manuscripts and editions in all languages, a study of the language of the work, and a detailed comparison of the differences between the various manuscripts and published texts.

This fragment apparently comes from a hitherto uncatalogued version; the text corresponds to no passage in the texts published by Kaltenbacher. But it is fairly easy to place it in the story. It is a conversation between hero and heroine, and clearly occurs at the time of the 'happy ending', when Paris has revealed his identity in the prison where Vienne is confined at her father's orders; and Vienne's father, Godeffroy de Lanson, Dauphin de Vienne, having recognized his rescuer from a Saracen dungeon as Paris (whom he would previously on no account consider as a suitable match for his daughter), now at last consents to the marriage of the lovers (p. 627 of Kaltenbacher's edition).

The fragment is written in a clear large fifteenth-century hand, 21 lines to the page:

(fo. 1)...sount en leur chambre en leurs delictz / et plaisirs et que la dame voit bien / qu'il a afaire d'elle. Il lui fait sy / bonne chiere et elle si estrange que / c'est merveilles. Car femme bien ap- / -prinse fait mille manieres toutes / nouvelles de faire bonne chiere a / qui elle vult et en ce faisant le bon / homme est bien aise qui n'a pas a- / -coustumé d'avoir bonne chiere. Lors / l'acose et baise et le bon homme lui dit / 'Vrayement m'amy, je cuide que vous / me vouldes aucune chose.' 'Par di- / -eu,

¹ Sir Sydney Cockerell further writes: the volume 'was Lot 742 in the Philipps sale of 1913 and I bought it from a bookseller 8 Aug. 1913. Philipps bought it c. 1861 from the bookseller Boone'.

mon amy,' fait elle, 'je ne veul riens / forsque me faches bonne chiere; pleut / ores a dieu que je n'eusse jamais autre / paradis fors seulement estre tousjours / entre vos deux bras. Par dieu, je n'en / vouldroye point d'autre vrayement', 'fait elle, 'mon amy, et ainsi me veulle / Dieu ayder que ma bouche ne tou- / (fol. 2) -cha jamais a homme, fors seulement / a la vostre et a vos cousins et aux / myens quant ilz venoient ceans, et / quant vous me commandiez que Je / les baisasse; mais je croy qu'il ne soit / au monde si doux et si gracieux que / vous estes'. 'M'amy', fait il, 'y avoit / ung tel escuyer qui cuyda estre ma- / rié avecques vous?' Fit elle, 'Par mon / ame, quant je vous euz veu premie- / rement si vous vey je bien de loing / et ne fis que vous entre-veoir, mais / Je n'eusse jamais prins d'autre et / eust esté monseigneur le daulphin / De Viennois. Je croy que dieu le voul- / loit ainsi. Car mon père et ma mère / me cuidoyent bien faire accorder a / lui, mais jamais je ne le feisse, ne / scay que c'est; je croy qu'il estoit desti- / né que ainsi fust.' Lors fait les / plaisirs, et a la dame se rendasses /

O. A. BECKERLEGGE.

SHEFFIELD.

GOETHE'S APPLICATION FOR THE COPYRIGHT OF THE FINAL EDITION
OF HIS COLLECTED WORKS (AUSGABE LETZTER HAND)

In 1816 Goethe had made a seven years' contract for the publication of his works (poems, plays and novels) in twenty volumes with the firm of J. G. Cotta in Stuttgart.¹ When this expired—Goethe was then in his seventy-third year—he began to think of bringing out a final edition of his collected works which should include everything that he had written.

At that time Germany was a Confederation of fifty-nine sovereign states with a Federal Diet (Bundes-Versammlung) at Frankfurt-am-Main consisting of the delegates of these states and presided over by the representative of Austria. No copyright laws as yet existed in the majority of these states and the only way in which an author could protect himself against unauthorized reprints of his works by unscrupulous publishers was by obtaining a *privilegium* in each state. As Goethe had suffered a good deal from the activities of pirate publishers, he now resolved to make every effort to secure from the Frankfurt Diet a *privilegium* of copyright, protecting his new edition in all the states forming the German Confederation.

On 2 November 1824 he wrote to Friedrich von Nagler, the Prussian delegate, asking for his help in the matter. Acting on Nagler's advice Goethe then wrote to Prince Metternich, the Austrian Chancellor, explaining the scope of the proposed edition and enclosing letters addressed to the Kings of Saxony, Bavaria, and Württemberg appealing for their support. This letter, dated 11 January 1825, was first printed in the *Wiener Zeitung*, No. 133 (1870), and reprinted in the Weimar edition of *Goethes Briefe*, xxxix, pp. 80 ff. The enclosures have apparently been lost

¹ See Goethe's letter to Cotta, 20 February 1815. Weimar edition, 'Abteilung' iv, vol. xxv, pp. 196–205.

or destroyed, only a copy, made by a clerk in a government office, having been preserved in the Weimar State Archives and printed first in *Die Grenzboten* (1874), III, pp. 265 ff. and later in the Weimar edition of *Goethes Briefe*, XXXIX, pp. 258 ff., in both cases with the note 'Die fehlenden Devotionsformeln am Schluss sind nach Analogie sonstiger Briefe ergänzt'.

Several months later, on 30 July, Goethe also applied to the Prince Elector of Hesse Cassel in almost identical terms. This letter too was thought to have been destroyed, but recently turned up among the acquisitions of a London bookseller and is now in my possession—the only one of the letters known to have been addressed by Goethe in this matter to German sovereigns which has come down to us in its original form and with Goethe's own full signature. It is written in German script, probably by Goethe's secretary John, but fully signed by Goethe himself, and covers four folio pages of thick brownish paper. In addressing the Elector Goethe altered 'allerhöchst' used in the letters to the three Kings to 'höchst', and 'allunterthanigster' speaking of himself to 'unterthanigster', besides making a few minor changes in spelling and punctuation. 'Submissst' instead of 'submisst' and 'werde' instead of 'würde' in the Weimar edition are obviously mistakes of the scribe or printer.

Durchlauchtigster Kurfürst,
gnädigster Kurfürst und Herr!

Ew. Königliche Hoheit haben die von Unterthanigst Unterzeichnetem bey der hohen Bundes-Versammlung eingereichte submisste Bitte um ein Privilegium für die Ausgabe seiner Werke letzter Hand schon eines allernadigsten Blickes gewürdigt, und ich erkuhne mich daher das Nähere zur Unterstützung jenes Gesuchs umständlicher vorzulegen.

Die Absicht ist, meine schriftstellerischen Arbeiten mit denen ich mich lebenslänglich beschäftigt und deren großer Teil schon gedruckt ist, gesammelt herauszugeben und hierauf meine letzten Lebensjahre zu verwenden.

Nun wurden zuerst die poetischen, rhetorischen, historischen, kritischen Arbeiten etwa vierzig Bände füllen; hierauf aber wäre dasjenige, was ich in Bezug auf bildende Kunst unternommen, nicht weniger was ich in der Naturwissenschaft versucht, in einer nicht fuglich zu bestimmenden Zahl von Bänden nachzubringen.

Da nun aber zu einem solchen Unternehmen schon mehrjährige Aufmerksamkeit und Bemühung erforderlich war, auch zunächst noch seyn wird, um zuletzt eine solche Rechenschaft abzulegen; so würde es um so wünschenswerther seyn, daß der Verfasser von den unausgesetzten Bemühungen seines Lebens billigmaßigen Vortheil ziehe, welcher durch den in Deutschland noch nicht zu hindernden Nachdruck gewöhnlich verkummert wird. Deshalb erkuhne ich nun, Ew. Königliche Hoheit hiedurch bescheiden anzugehen, mich in allen in Höchst Ihr Landen gegen den Nachdruck schon bestehenden Gesetzen und Anordnungen einzuschließen, besonders aber für gedachte vollständige kritische Ausgabe meiner Werke ein Privilegium zu ertheilen, so daß ich gegen den Nachdruck und dessen Verkauf in Höchst Ihren Staaten völlig gesichert sey, unter Androhung der Confiscation und sonstiger Strafen, welche theils den Landesgesetzen nach schon bestehen, oder künftig für nöthig erachtet werden möchten.

Und zwar wage ich mir ein solches Privilegium für mich, meine Erben und Erbnehmer in der¹ Maße zu erbitten, daß sowohl ich den Verlag selbst oder in Gemeinschaft besorge, als auch wenn ich einem Verleger die Befugniß übertrüge, dieser des gesetzlichen Schutzes genießen möge.

Sollte es hieby nicht genehm seyn, diese Ausgabe der letzten Hand, die für künftig keine Abänderung erleiden, auch um einen annehmlchen Preis verkauflich seyn soll, auf unbestimmte Zeit zu privilegiren, so erlaube mir doch die unterthänigste Bitte, den anzusetzenden Termin auf fünfzig Jahre zu erstrecken, damit meine Familie sich auch unter die vielen mitzahlen dürfte, welche in Höchst Ihro Landen eines dauerhaft beschützten Glückes genießen.

Und so wurde ich denn auch nicht ermangeln, das mir so vortheilhaft als ehrenvoll gegonnnte Privilegium auf eine geziemende Weise dem Publikum vor Augen zu bringen.

Eine solche gnadigste Vergünstigung wurde ich mit dem reinsten, devotesten Danke erkennen und für die höchste Belohnung achten, die mir für meine unausgesetzten vieljährigen Bemühungen nur immer hatte zu Theil werden können.

In tiefster Ehrfurcht

Ew. Königlichen Hoheit

unterthänigster Diener

Weimar, am 30. Julius 1825.

JOHANN WOLFGANG VON GOETHE.

TRANSLATION

Your Royal Highness has already deigned to look favourably upon the most humble request for a privilege for the final edition of his works which the undersigned submitted to the Federal Diet, and I am therefore emboldened to lay before you a more detailed statement of the facts in support of my application.

My intention is to publish a collected edition of my writings, at which I have been working all my life and most of which have already been printed, and to devote the rest of my life to this task. To begin with, my poetical, rhetorical, historical and critical works would fill about 40 volumes; later on all that I have written on art as well as my attempts in the domain of natural science would have to be added in supplementary volumes the number of which it is difficult to estimate.

Now as such an undertaking has already taken several years of close attention and effort and will require several more in order to render such a complete account of my life work, it would be all the more desirable that the author should reap a fair and adequate reward for the unceasing labour of a lifetime, which however in Germany is as a rule considerably reduced by the impossibility of preventing pirated reprints. I therefore venture humbly to beg your Royal Highness to include me in all the laws and regulations against reprints already existing in your territories, and above all to grant me a privilege for the proposed complete critical edition of my works, so that I may be entirely safeguarded against reprints and the sale of the same in your Royal Highness' domains by the threat of confiscation and other penalties, which are either to some extent already in force according to the laws of the land or may in future be considered necessary.

And I venture to appeal for such a privilege for myself, my heirs and their beneficiaries to such an extent that the publication may enjoy the protection of the law whether I publish it myself or with a partner or whether I hand over the rights to a publishing firm.

Should it not appear desirable to you to grant for an indefinite period this privilege for the final edition which in future may not be altered and is also to be sold at a reasonable price, I venture humbly to request that the time limit may be extended to 50 years, so that my family may be numbered among the many who in your Royal Highness' domains enjoy a state of permanently secured happiness.

I should not fail to bring to the notice of the public in a fitting manner this privilege which would bring me material advantage as well as honour.

¹ The feminine noun *die Maße* was frequently used by Goethe.

So gracious a favour I should acknowledge with the most loyal gratitude and esteem it as the greatest reward ever accorded me for my unceasing efforts during many long years.

In deepest devotion

Your Royal Highness' most humble servant

JOHANN WOLFGANG VON GOETHE.

The Prussian delegate Nagler moved for the granting of the *privilegium* at a sitting of the Diet and after protracted debates, in which Austria was the principal opponent, it was granted, but only for 40 years. The document, dated 3 October 1825, was sent to Goethe. On 26 February 1826 Goethe signed and sealed his contract¹ for 12 years with Cotta who agreed to pay down 5000 Thaler (about £750), and 60,000 Thaler (about £9000) in three instalments, and promised to give him or his heirs a share in the profits after the sale of 20,000 copies. On 4 March Cotta issued a prospectus for which Goethe had written a long introduction,² dated 1 March 1826, and in the spring of 1827 Cotta published the first ten volumes of *Goethes Werke, Vollständige Ausgabe letzter Hand*, bearing on the title-page the words: *Mit des durchlauchtigsten deutschen Bundes schutzendem Privilegium*. Goethe supervised the printing of vols. I–XL (1828–31). After his death Riemer and Eckermann, who had already been assisting him in the work, took over the editorship, beginning in 1832 with the publication of *Faust, Part II*, which, with the exception of Act III, had not been printed before. They completed their task in the autumn of 1833 with the publication of volume LV.

H. G. FIEDLER.

OXFORD.

¹ See Goethe's *Tagebuch*, Weimar edition, Abt. III, x, p. 166.

² Printed in Weimar edition, Abt. I, XLII, I, pp. 109–20.

REVIEWS

European Balladry. By W. J. ENTWISTLE. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1939. x+404 pp. 17s. 6d.

European Balladry marks an epoch in the study of the ballad. For the first time a comprehensive detailed study has been made on scientific principles of the nature, history, distribution and regional development of the ballad. This work has involved an examination not only of the ballads of north-western Europe, but also of a wide range of oral narrative and lyrical poetry of kindred or allied form and theme from almost every European country. No study of this subject of so wide a range has been attempted before.

Professor Entwistle not only gives us an invaluable general comparative survey of this wide field, but in addition there are self-contained detailed studies of practically every individual ballad area. The whole subject is thus lifted on to a new and higher plane than hitherto. Probably no living scholar is so well qualified to make such a survey as the author, who has acquired a first-hand reading knowledge of practically every language involved, including Finnish, various Slavonic languages, and Danish, not to mention others in which he is our chief authority.

The author approaches his subject as a scholar and linguist and also as a man of letters. The ballad is studied not only in its rise and dispersion, and the relationship of various ballad groups, but also in its decline. A distinctive feature of this study is the attention given to the literary ballad, especially in Germany, where it exercised a special influence on the poetry of the eighteenth century. In this book for the first time the milieu and environment of ballad recital, and the dance and song which are relevant to this particular form of oral literature, are seriously treated as an integral part of ballad studies. Professor Entwistle has made a special study of the musical themes associated with ballads in various countries. This is pioneer work and must be regarded as one of the most important features of the book. It is part of the author's economy that he nowhere wastes time on destructive criticism. Despite the great learning which the work implies everywhere, there is no parade of mere information. Instead of the all too common 'bibliography' we have relevant and up to date references in text and footnotes, more especially to recent or rare works which, without such signposts, might well elude our knowledge.

The book is divided into two parts. Part I (pp. 1-131), *Ballads in General*, is a general comparative survey and comprises eight chapters. Chapter I, *People and Poets*, introduces us with light touch to the homes of folk poetry to-day, to the minstrels and their audience, and to the

question of authorship. There are some interesting considerations on the relationship of ballads to nationalism:

Ballads have power to declare nationality and separate neighbours, but they have also power to unite those whom history has put asunder. The old common feelings of Scotland, Norway, and Denmark, revealed in the ballads, have been to some extent recovered in modern times.... The scores of English ballads alive in the American mountains... are firm testimony to the cousinship of the two nations.

Chapter II examines the question *What is a Ballad*, and discusses the form and metre, the manner of reciting and literary characteristics. The author rightly declares that ballads were never the product of a community—'Artistic creation under such conditions would be impossible'—but he does not underrate the part played by the reciters, and the freedom with which the oral text is treated at every fresh recital. Chapter IV, one of the most important and technical, is devoted to *Tunes*; Chapters V and VI treat of *Kinds and Dates*, and *How Ballads Spread*; Chapters VII and VIII treat of *The Descent of Ballads*, and *The Ascent of Ballads*—the latter relates the oral to the written form.

Part II (pp. 132-380), *Ballads in Particular*, consists of detailed studies of special ballad groups which are classed as: I. Romance Ballads; II. Nordic Ballads; III. Balkan Ballads; IV. Russian Ballads.

In this part the author enters every group as an authority, giving us a close examination of the individual ballad material and its development, both within the group and in relationship to ballad traditions elsewhere. His attitude is judicial. There is a complete absence of prejudice, or political bias. Opinions are offered with the modesty which characterizes the whole work.

It will no doubt be found, it must indeed be inevitable, that in such a wide field departmental specialists will feel in a position to add or detract from some points of detail. One may not agree with Professor Entwistle, for example, in attributing the Finnish method of reciting to magical practices and the influence of the round dance. To me it seems more probable that occupations and their accompanying rhythm, such as we see in Quern Songs, like the Norse *Grottasóngr*, are more directly responsible for the swaying movement and the nakedness. One could wish also that the author had availed himself more fully of the recent work of northern scholars on Finnish and Esthonian oral poetry; but this is an ungenerous criticism from one who realizes that the author has been more wisely employed in acquiring a first-hand knowledge of the poetry, and who envies him his knowledge of these languages. In regard to Great Russia also one feels that the treatment is somewhat summary where both the actual material and also the native Russian critical matter are so rich; but again he offers us the fruits of first-hand knowledge of the Ukrainian and Rumanian literature, for which all students of Great Russian oral poetry must be grateful, and many of us envious.

But the author might well reply, in regard to both the Finnish and the Russian material, that these are, after all, only on the border of his

subject. I should indeed myself still persist in regarding these, and also the Yugoslav material, as belonging rather to the tradition of the oral epic than of the ballad. In subject, in metre, in diction and in style, they seem to me to be more closely akin to the great written epics of Ancient Europe and the modern oral epics of Asia than to the ballads. But these are big questions, and the author has been too wise, as Ker was too wise also, to narrow his conception of the ballad down to a meagre definition. The happiest settlement of the question would be a new book by Professor Entwistle himself on Epic Poetry on similar lines to *European Balladry*, which would place all students of oral poetry under a still heavier debt to him.

In these days of narrow specialization and minutiae such a book comes as a surprise and delight to those who regard our studies as a branch of humanism. The author has demonstrated the possibility of a perfect balance between minute erudition and the firm grasp and synthetic co-ordination of a far-flung survey. Only a keen imaginative vision and love of literature for its own sake could have sustained the author through the immense labour, especially the linguistic labour, of his studies, and it is a part of his special achievement that his work remains throughout primarily a study of literature. The critical discernment and love of good poetry which characterize *European Balladry* for its own sake will appeal to a far wider circle of readers than those who only read of ballads in the study.

NORA K. CHADWICK.

CAMBRIDGE.

The Place-Names of Nottinghamshire (English Place-Name Society, Volume xvii). By J. E. B. GOVER, ALLEN MAWER and F. M. STENTON. Cambridge: University Press. 1940. xlii + 348 pp. 21s.

The seventeenth volume of the English Place-Name Society does not perhaps contain as much varied and interesting material as some of its predecessors. This may be due in part to the rarity of pre-Conquest documents surviving from this area, for the scarcity of early forms has greatly added to the difficulties of interpretation of the names of this county, and many of those which the editors have left unexplained may conceal elements of interest. The editors have been wise in leaving the verdict open in doubtful or difficult cases. In several instances, as, for example, Carburton (p. 71), Greasley (p. 144), Averham (p. 181) and Keyworth (pp. 247 f.), the volume performs the negative service of showing previously published views to be untenable; in other cases a more probable solution is substituted, for example in Leverton (pp. 33 f.), Goverton (pp. 155 f.), Epperstone (p. 162), Ossington (p. 195) and Besthorpe (p. 201).

The chief matters of historical interest are dealt with in the introduction, namely evidence relating to the Anglian settlement and to the Scandinavian occupation. As regards the first of these, place-name

evidence supports that of archaeology in suggesting that the settlement began in the Trent valley, nearly all archaic names being found in this area. Reference might have been made in this section to the occurrence in the county of the name Saxondale, which seems to denote an isolated Saxon settlement in Anglian territory (see p. 241).

As Nottingham was one of the Danish Five Boroughs, it was to be expected that Scandinavian influence should be strong in the county, and the introduction shows how this reveals itself in a number of ways, whether in names that are completely Scandinavian in origin, or in hybrid names combining English and Scandinavian elements, or in names in which the earlier English form was modified under Scandinavian influence. In addition to the instances given on pp. xvii-xviii, we may note the hybrids Broadbusk (p. 166), *Routhecroft* (p. 278), Fox Wood, earlier *Foxthweyt* (p. 180) and Holbeck (p. 176), where the Scandinavian second element is on record from 1180 replacing the English termination seen in the *on holan broc* of an Old English charter. It is of interest also that the Scandinavian form *Staineforth* of Stanford-on-Soar (p. 255) is first recorded as late as 1521. It may be that other names had Scandinavian by-forms that have left no trace in records. An interesting survival is pointed out on p. 203, where it is shown that in 1269 the terms *Northeby* and *Sutheby*, i.e. ON *norðr í bý* and *suðr í bý*, are used of North and South Collingham. Minor names supply, among other things, the Scandinavian expression 'Long Friday' (p. 293), *kunungesker* and *Cungesdale* in Blyth (p. 301), from ON *konungr + kiarr, dalr, Thynghou* 'assembly hill' (p. 284), in addition to the word *plousweirn* mentioned in the introduction (p. xxi) and to names containing Scandinavian personal names, such as *Colbenfurlang* and *Longlevingrave* (p. 320), with ON *Kolbeinn* and *Langlíf* respectively. If the first element in *Conigeshou* (p. 284) refers to the occupant of the barrow, as seems established with regard to the *Grani* of *Granehou* (p. xxi), we may have a reference to the burial-place of one of the kings who led the invaders.

The volume yields information on some matters of interest besides the general problems dealt with in the introduction. There is an interesting note on the identification of Bede's *Tiowulfingacæstir* with Littleborough (pp. 35 f.). We learn from the name Misterton (pp. 36 f.) that this place once possessed a *mynster*, probably here a community of secular clergy. References to old meeting-places occur, besides *Thynghou* mentioned above: Speller Hill (p. 220) and Spellow (p. 241), both meaning 'speech hill', and *Spellacre* 'speech acre' (p. 275), Hanger Hill (p. 92), formerly *Thynghowe* 'hill of assembly', and Moulter Hill (p. 253), from ON *móthaugr* with the same meaning. Earlier types of land-tenure are indicated in the names Sherwood 'wood belonging to the shire' (p. 10); Earlishaw House (p. 184), *Erleswonge* and *Sherevewong* (p. 292), Rayton (p. 108), if from *(ge)ræfa-tūn* 'reeve-farm', all apparently referring to official holdings; Drinsey (p. 208), *Drengalandes* and *Drengfeld* (p. 279) containing ON *drengr* 'young man', 'servant', which may be compared with Knapeney

(pp. 54 f.) and Chilwell (p. 142), as these contain respectively OE gen. pl. *cnapena* and *cilda* 'of young men'. Finally, some additions are made to our knowledge of the vocabulary of preceding centuries, and these are listed on p. 327. No explanation is given of the name *cokwatergang* in Nottingham (p. 16), but this must surely contain the term *cockwater* in a meaning similar to sense 2 in *N.E.D.*: 'A stream of water brought in a trough, through a long pole, in order to wash out the sand of the tin-ore into the launder, while it is bruising in the coffer of a stamping-mill.' The *N.E.D.* has no instance other than this definition of 1753, whereas the place-name shows it in use in 1395.

The work has been carried out with the usual care and I have noted few errors or omissions. The Society is to be congratulated on carrying on its work with undiminished efficiency under wartime conditions.

DOROTHY WHITELOCK.

OXFORD.

Christopher Marlowe. A Biographical and Critical Study. By FREDERICK S. BOAS. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1940. xii + 336 pp. 15s.

In this book Dr Boas has brought up to date the story of the life of Marlowe, and of some of Marlowe's acquaintances, which he told in 1929 in *Marlowe and his Circle*. He has now rounded out his work by adding a chapter on each of Marlowe's seven plays, one on the translations from Ovid and Lucan, one on the original poems, and one on 'Marlowe through the Centuries'. While he rarely breaks new ground, he assembles the results brought to light by many searchers both from the rich mines of English archives in Canterbury, Cambridge, and London, and from the great libraries where scholars have rediscovered so many of the books and maps that Marlowe may have read.

On most of the controversial questions concerning Marlowe or his work Dr Boas presents the views which he and his fellow-editors have already made familiar in the volumes of the Case edition. I cannot follow him in his preference for the 1616 text of *Faustus* over that of 1604, or in his dating the play later than May 1592, instead of in 1588 or 1589. He passes over lightly the important evidence of the ballad on Faustus entered in the Stationers' Register on 28 February 1588/9; but surely the most likely way for the ballad-writer to have become acquainted with the story of Faustus would have been to see Marlowe's play on the stage. Since Dr Boas wrote, Paul Kocher in *Modern Language Notes* (February 1940) has cited an allusion made in 1590 to a published pamphlet on Faustus, probably the *English Faust-Book* which was Marlowe's source. This makes it all the more difficult to accept the theory that the *English Faust-Book* was not printed before 1592. Even if it were not printed earlier, however, the suggestion that Marlowe may have read the English version in manuscript would be more than a 'purely arbitrary assumption', as Dr Boas calls it. It would be the most probable explanation of

the known facts, and quite in accord with Marlowe's use of manuscript sources in *Tamburlaine*.

Dr Boas will not allow that Marlowe made any use of unpublished sources in *Tamburlaine*. Since both parts of the play were on the stage in 1587, and since the text published in 1590 contains obvious borrowings from *The Faerie Queene* (1590) and from Paul Ive's *Practise of Fortification* (1589), the generally accepted explanation is that Marlowe must have seen Ive's treatise and at least part of *The Faerie Queene* in manuscript. Instead, Dr Boas argues that Marlowe did not use Spenser and Ive when he wrote his play but inserted the borrowed passages in 1590. This hypothesis requires the assumption that Marlowe revised the two parts of *Tamburlaine* before publication. There is nothing to show, however, that Marlowe had any hand in publishing the play, the preface to which is signed by the printer, Richard Jones. Dr Boas thinks it unlikely that Marlowe would have had access to Spenser's unpublished work 'or felt at liberty to draw so freely upon it'. Yet Abraham Fraunce was quoting *The Faerie Queene* in his *Arcadian Rhetorike* in 1588, and at Cambridge Marlowe had been in an excellent position to see any manuscript selections from the poem which may have been handed about by Gabriel Harvey or other friends of Spenser. As for feeling at liberty to use manuscript work, Marlowe and his fellow-playwrights constantly borrowed other men's verses. Dr Boas himself remarks, concerning an imitation of *The Spanish Tragedy* in *Arden of Feversham*: 'Marlowe, on the other hand, was a frequent borrower, and he might readily have adapted Kyd's lines to his own use, especially at a time when they were in close contact' (p. 199). In *Tamburlaine* Marlowe was writing lines for actors to speak rather than for printers to publish. It seems much more likely that he took over verses from Spenser in 1587 with only stage performance in mind than that he deliberately added them in 1590 to be printed under his own name just after they had at last been published as Spenser's.

The most surprising opinion expressed in the book is that Marlowe may have been the author of *Arden of Feversham*, or at least of its 'finest flights', as suggested by Oliphant (whose argument in *The New Criterion*, January 1926, should have been cited). *Arden* is an excellent play, but it ought not to be attributed to Marlowe without better grounds than Dr Boas is able to produce. Its commonplaces on Ovid, Endymion, and 'sweet verse' are treated in an embroidered style unlike Marlowe's sharp vigour. Parallels with *Edward II* and *The Jew of Malta* may equally well be borrowings in either direction. Marlowe was not the only Elizabethan keenly interested in devices for poisoning; conspiracies against the Queen had made them common talk. As for 'the emphasis upon the rivalry of two men for a woman's love', what dramatist has not used so obvious a source of conflict? Surely Marlowe made less of it than did Kyd or most of his contemporaries. The problem of *Arden's* authorship will not be solved by such gossamer arguments as these.

Dr Boas rightly declares that the crowning virtue of Marlowe's poetic dialogue lies in 'a perfect lucidity and precision which translate thoughts and emotions into rhythmical speech with felicitous exactness' (p. 313). This, as he says, 'is in the deepest sense the "classical" element in Marlowe's genius'. Throughout the book he shows how much Marlowe owed to his early love for Latin poets, Ovid, Virgil and Lucan. He devotes more attention than any previous critic has done to Marlowe as a translator, balancing Marlowe's occasional mistranslations with his general faithfulness, 'instinctive artistry', and varied vocabulary. Not all the words which Dr Boas regards as rare (p. 38) were rare in Marlowe's time: for example, 'rivelled' (wrinkled) is described by the *N.E.D.* as 'Very common c. 1530-1720', and 'a-life' (dearly) and 'hoodwink'd' in a literal sense were also thoroughly familiar. So were several words which Dr Boas singles out (p. 234) from *Hero and Leander*, such as 'idiot' (ignorant person), 'affied' (betrothed), and 'pais'd' (weighed. see *N.E.D.* under the first meaning of 'peise', to weigh). When he refers in the second paragraph of p. 46 to the 'hexameter', he apparently means the 'pentameter'. We may be grateful to Dr Boas for his careful study of the translations, supported by so many specific instances. He finds the cardinal virtues of Marlowe's translation from Lucan 'its verbal resonance and melodious rhythm' and quotes renderings by Marlowe from Ovid which are 'notably lucid and melodious'. It is strange, therefore, that he undervalues the far more beautiful melody of 'Come live with me and be my love'.

The account of Marlowe's life is generally reliable, despite a few slight inaccuracies. Marlowe was not in residence at his college during the last four weeks of Michaelmas term, 1580, according to the buttery books discovered by Bakeless, but during the last three weeks, the three before Christmas; and all Dr Boas's references to the weeks of term (pp. 10-14) should be corrected to bring them into accord with the college records. Dr Boas twice remarks (pp. 103, 307) that Kyd does not mention Watson among Marlowe's friends; he forgets (perhaps) that Kyd was writing in 1593 and that Watson had died in 1592. He conjectures that Kyd's parents 'wished to disassociate themselves entirely from a son whose career had ended in disgrace' (p. 284) because they renounced the administration of his goods, actually, such renunciation means only that the deceased left more debts than assets. But these are minor points. The story of Marlowe's life is clearly and fairly told; and Dr Boas may be congratulated upon having written a well-balanced book which both the general reader and the scholar can enjoy.

MARK ECCLES.

MADISON, WISCONSIN.

The Variants in the First Quarto of 'King Lear'. A Bibliographical and Critical Inquiry. (Supplement to the Bibliographical Society's Transactions, No. 15.) By W. W. GREG. London: Oxford University Press, for the Bibliographical Society. 1940 (for 1939). viii + 192 pp.

In this monograph Dr Greg makes three contributions of major importance: (1) textual materials for a critical edition of *King Lear*; (2) criteria for determining the relative authority of the early editions of the play; and (3) the discovery, by tracing the bibliographical history of the Pide Bull quarto, of a hitherto unknown printing-house technique.

Since the days of Halliwell-Phillipps, twelve copies of the first (Pide Bull) quarto of *King Lear* have been known to bibliographers, but no editor has taken the trouble to collate each of them minutely. This neglect has now been repaired by Dr Greg, who not only tabulates the variants with meticulous accuracy but indicates whether they occur in the original or the corrected states of the formes. Of the 167 variants now on record, 24 substantive and 19 consequent variants are here listed for the first time. One appendix is devoted to misprints in the quarto; another provides a list of some hundreds of readings that are doubtful because of broken type, faulty inking or careless press work. In still another appendix is a body of material of very considerable interest, namely a tabulation of the more important of the thousands of manuscript alterations of the text made by early owners in seven of the twelve extant copies of *Lear*. Though four-fifths of the alterations affect punctuation only, the others 'throw light not only on linguistic and other usages of the time, but upon the question of what weight should attach to the conjectures of an intelligent reader within half a century of Shakespeare's death'. Of BM², the copy that has been subjected to the most thorough-going alteration, Dr Greg observes (pp. 114-15)

that the play was read with a good deal of care, and that the anonymous corrector brought considerable patience and some intelligence to his task. At the same time it is no less clear that his knowledge and insight were madequate and intermittent. . . . His endeavours certainly do not support the claim sometimes made that a contemporary reader had an advantage over the modern critic in the elucidation of an author's text. We may be thankful that our corrector's exemplar was never used as copy for a later edition, and his work bears out the maxim that the blunders of an honest compositor are generally less disastrous to the text than the attempts of a would-be intelligent reader to emend them.

The task of establishing the text of *King Lear* is complicated by many factors. As is well known, Shakespeare had no hand in its printing, and the manuscript from which the first quarto was set provided an inferior text. The proofs of that quarto were corrected by a reader of the press whose chief business was, not to ascertain and perpetuate the intentions of the author (with whom he had no contact whatever), but merely 'to restore the reading of the copy where the compositor had corrupted it'. Dr Greg is persuaded that the reader did consult his copy, but that in making corrections he did not always follow it. The manuscript that had caused for the compositor so many difficulties frequently proved too

difficult for the proofreader, who in an attempt to remove manifest absurdities resorted to guesswork. This guessing by the proofreading editor, sardonically remarks Dr Greg (p. 136), 'was, no doubt, reprehensible, but in doing so he was, after all, but anticipating the practice of a long succession of subsequent editors'. His corrections have no higher authority than his all too imperfect copy, and, further, we are not even 'bound to accept his evidence as to its readings'. No longer can the editor of a Shakespearean text be satisfied with merely adopting the readings of the corrected state of each forme of his basic text; on the contrary,

each several variant must be subjected to scrutiny, and considered in the light of all the evidence that can be brought to bear upon it; and it is only when supported by the clearest intrinsic probability or by unequivocal external testimony that the reader's emendations can be accepted as certainly correct.

Fortunately there is an external control for the study of the text of the *Pride Bull Lear*, namely the First Folio, a text ostensibly independent. Back of the Folio text was indeed an independent manuscript of unquestionable authority, possibly Shakespeare's own draft, but more probably a playhouse copy. But the First Folio text unfortunately was not printed directly from this good manuscript. Instead Jaggard used a copy of the First Quarto which had been collated with it. It must be left to students of the text of *Lear* to explore with Dr Greg all the ramifications of this phase of the subject. They must, on the one hand, identify, if possible, the corrected and uncorrected quarto readings which survive in the Folio text, and, on the other hand, determine the cases in which the authoritative reading is to be found in (1) the uncorrected state of a sheet of Q_1 , or (2) the corrected state of a sheet of Q_1 , or (3) the First Folio. There is even a set of circumstances in which the notorious 1619 Second Quarto might have to be recognized as the authoritative source of a reading!

The section devoted to the analysis of the variants (pp. 152-79) illustrates the caution which an editor of Shakespeare must exercise in establishing a text, and affords Dr Greg full scope for his ingenuity. The discussions of 'alapt' (1. 4. 366), 'these . the wast' (2. 1. 102), 'Come and tends service' (2. 4. 103) and 'he gins the web, the pin- | queues the eye' (3. 4. 122) deserve special consideration and commendation. It may be observed that if, as Dr Greg thinks likely, the copy for the *Pride Bull* quarto was produced with the aid of stenography, 'raging' would be an easy misreading of the symbol for Folio's 'roaring' (3. 4. 10).

Of great interest to all bibliographers is Dr Greg's solution of the problem which has its crux in the anomalous catchword on K_4 . It is a rare pleasure to follow him as he reconstructs the story of the printing of the quarto. The evidence points to the conclusion that after Okes discovered a number of serious errors in the inner forme of Sheet C he felt the need of a much more careful reading of the proofs, with the result that one forme of each of the remaining sheets (excepting I and L) contains

press corrections. Hitherto bibliographers have tacitly assumed that invariant formes (in this as in other books) have not benefited from careful proofreading and correction, that is to say, they represent the uncorrected state of the text. Thanks to the survival of the Gorhambury copy of the quarto with the corrected catchword on K₄ recto (a press correction in an otherwise generally invariant forme), Dr Greg is able to establish the fact that in this book, at least, the invariant formes *must be* in the corrected state. This is revolutionary, and since there is good reason to believe that other men besides Okes employed the technique used in printing the *Pide Bull Lear*, the textual study of the plays of this period must be modified to take account of Dr Greg's findings.

In elucidating this bibliographical problem, Dr Greg is led to the conclusion (pp. 52-4) that the first sheets to be printed from the invariant forme of a sheet were those which had already been printed on the other side from the uncorrected state of the variant forme; i.e. when the invariant forme was received from the hands of the reader, press-work stopped on the variant forme (which was at once sent to the reader for correction) and then the half-printed sheets were perfected. Only after this had been done were the remaining sheets printed on one side, to be perfected in turn when the variant forme should be returned by the reader in its corrected state. Unless the edition was exceptionally large, I find it difficult to accept this explanation, for it involves the perfecting of sheets yet damp with ink. If, for example, half the pulls had been taken from the uncorrected state of the variant forme at the time printing was interrupted, one might expect Okes to defer the perfecting of these damp sheets until after he had worked off the remaining sheets from the invariant forme. By the time these pulls had been taken and the first half of the sheets had been perfected, the proofreader would have been able to correct and return the variant forme for use in perfecting the second half of the sheets. Thus the risk of blurring and smearing the damp ink could be largely avoided.

The monograph under review is a milestone marking the progress of the application of bibliographical methods to textual study; it is, also, the foundation stone on which future editors and textual commentators of Elizabethan texts must build. So complex are the problems which Dr Greg discovers, and so rigorous the standards of solution he sets, that scholars may well quail before the task of editing a Shakespearian play.

JAMES G. McMANAWAY.

WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Jacobean and Caroline Stage. Dramatic Companies and Players. By GERALD EADES BENTLEY. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1941. 2 vols. xx+748 pp. 42s.

Here is a book of great importance, which continues the work of Sir Edmund Chambers upon the English stage, bringing the record in certain main aspects up to the closing of the theatres in 1642. It might have

been hoped that Sir Edmund would have completed his herculean task himself. But we owe him enough in all conscience. And it is known that his interest was primarily in Shakespeare and the setting for Shakespeare's work and Shakespearian scholarship. Nor is this continuation of his record of the medieval stage and the Elizabethan stage a light task. It was a task to be undertaken only by a man of undaunted courage and industry, as well as of scholarly competence, willing to give up to it no mean tale of years. Elizabethan scholarship has been fortunate in finding such a successor to Sir Edmund in Mr Bentley, and the long-desired book of reference for some matters concerning the Jacobean and Caroline stage is now before us. These two volumes take their place on a busy shelf in the scholar's library beside the eight volumes of Sir Edmund's work, as an instalment of the complete record which Mr Bentley contemplates, on the lines of *The Elizabethan Stage*.

Mr Bentley first made known to scholars in 1928, in the *Times Literary Supplement*, that he was in the field of discovery and collection of facts concerning the stage, beginning with the very fruitful study of unprinted parish registers and wills, a source of information which has been surprisingly neglected until recently. From these beginnings he has moved on to the huge constructive task which he has now completed in part, the labours for which, one gathers from his Preface, were finished by 1938.

The present volumes deal with dramatic companies and players. Further volumes are to come, upon plays and playwrights, and upon theatres and conditions of play production. And it appears that the third volume has made considerable progress since 1938. It may well be, however, that war conditions in England have prevented Mr Bentley from completing his research in this part of his subject, English archives being no longer accessible. The same problem affects the reviewer of Mr Bentley's book, and any review written in England, in particular, is bound to suffer from this disability. The destruction of one's private library is a further inconvenience.

The first volume deals with the history of each of the principal companies in turn, with lists of actors, of plays at court, of the company's repertory, and of provincial notices. The second volume contains a biographical dictionary of players, and an appendix mainly of documents followed by a fifty-page index.

Mr Bentley has taken pains, and the Clarendon Press has given him every facility and skilled craftsmanship, in the setting-out of his enormous mass of detailed information for ready and convenient use. The Actor Lists for the King's Company are a striking example. It is easy to find one's way about the book and to know where to look for what one is seeking. And I have found the index both accurate and helpful. Such a book is by no means easy to index, especially in reference to subjects. The real difficulty in this respect will arise when further volumes are published. It is to be hoped that Mr Bentley and the Clarendon Press

will consider the advisability of a consolidated index for the whole work when completed.

I cannot use the occasion of this review more fruitfully than by making some reference to unpublished material, which Mr Bentley mentions several times. Having regretted the failure of Professor Wallace to publish material discovered by him, I have myself come under my own condemnation. I can, however, plead the duties of a hard-working Professorship with no sabbatical relief, of University administration, and of the editorship of this *Review*. I did, indeed, seek to enlist the interest of the principal foundation in this country for the encouragement of research, some years ago, in the hope of obtaining a year's leisure for completing and publishing these and other allied discoveries, but without success. I have, moreover, handed over material to scholars in order to get it made available, as in a joint volume *Thomas Lodge and other Elizabethans*. Indeed, had I known in time of Mr Bentley's proposals, I would willingly have given him the necessary references in respect of matters concerning the Red Bull and Queen Anne's Company, as I have elsewhere for material concerning, e.g. More, Milton and Drayton. The important thing is to make knowledge available. And a systematic examination of Chancery depositions, and of Star Chamber proceedings, provides material in unmanageable abundance.

For the present, therefore, I have put together some observations¹ upon the Worth v. Baskerville depositions and other documents, in the hope that they may serve towards Mr Bentley's third volume. I find, fortunately, that some of my notes upon these matters have escaped the general destruction of my collection of photostats and other original material. They will serve as a supplement to this review.

I note that the preliminary bibliography does not include my article on 'Mr and Mrs Browne of the Boar's Head' in *Life and Letters Today*, Winter 1936, which gives a different picture of this theatre from the accepted view, and contains an account of the actual transformation of an inn-yard theatre, and of its organization and vicissitudes. But Mr Bentley can hardly be blamed if this escaped his very vigilant eye and industry, considering that it did not appear in one of the normal vehicles of stage scholarship. In general, the inn-yard theatre has not yet had its full due of attention. The subject is, of course, mainly anterior to Mr Bentley's field. But his book may serve a further useful purpose if in his preliminary summaries of Sir Edmund Chambers's work he were able to indicate in passing any new information available since *The Elizabethan Stage* appeared.

A few notes may conclude this review. I observe that a footnote in vol. I, p. 148 refers to 'an odd slip' on the part of Andrew Cave concerning the Palsgrave's Company. But surely Cave was wrong only in his dates. The company had formerly been 'the then Prince of Wales his Servants', i.e. Prince Henry's Men, until the death of Prince Henry, who was

¹ See pp. 25-36 above.

Prince of Wales, in 1612, when they came under the patronage of the Palsgrave. There is no question here of any relation to Prince Charles, who only became Prince of Wales after the death of Prince Henry.

Any doubt about the identity of the Jacobean actor Richard Baxter with the Restoration actor of that name is settled by the identity of signatures of depositions in Chancery in 1623 and in 1665 (II, p. 361). The 'Richard, son of John Perkins', born in 1585, could not be the actor, who was born *ca.* 1579, unless his own memory is seriously at fault (II, p. 526).

It may be regretted that Mr Bentley has had to depend on the printed extracts from the Middlesex County Records. Some of the quotations are unsatisfactory, e.g. Vol. I, pp. 166-7. In general, there is much in the original records at the Middlesex Guildhall which would repay examination, as I have found.

Incidentally, it is quite likely that Mr Bentley might have found more material for his very interesting specimens of actors' wills in the Hustings Rolls of the City of London. Ellis Worth's will would almost certainly be found there, as his estate is dealt with in Repertories, as a merchant-taylor. So also the records of the great Guilds, of which many actors were members, would yield much information.

Misprints are few in this difficult piece of typography. I note on p. vi 'Allerdyce' for 'Allardyce'. Dr W. J. Lawrence was never a University Professor (p. vii), nor is Dr A. M. Clark as yet a holder of a Chair (p. 41). Baxter certainly was an actor, though not a sharer in the King's Men in 1636, and therefore a 'dependant' (pp. 49, 50, n. 2). The Bodleian play of *Alexis and Alice* (p. 123) is very visibly a crude amateur's effort, with some indications of the nursery about it!

It is a cheering thought that men can still engage upon, and bring forth, major enterprises in scholarship. The *Cambridge Bibliography*, the last volume of the great edition of Drayton, and now this book, all coming out during the period of the most determined attempt to suppress truth and to subdue mankind to baser ends, are matters of comfort. We look forward to Volume Three, and think it important, even if its end is not the aggrandisement of a man or a nation, but only to seek and record the truth. And Elizabethan scholarship offers the happiest of many examples of long-enduring Anglo-American collaboration, of the welcome invaders of our shores, of a common spiritual home and spiritual ends. *Eppure si muove.*

C. J. Sisson.

LONDON.

The Aesthetic Theory of Thomas Hobbes. By CLARENCE DEWITT THORPE (*University of Michigan Publications, Language and Literature*, Vol. XVIII). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1940. x+340 pp. \$4.00.

One does not associate a love of poetry and an interest in literary criticism with the somewhat sardonic figure of Thomas Hobbes, 'irritabile illud et vanissimum Malmesburiense animal', as he was once unkindly described by a contemporary. But the facts are that Hobbes has to his credit two short essays bearing directly on the beauty of poetry and that frequent references may be found in his major works to matters which closely concern the literary critic. The present full-length study of Hobbes's aesthetic theory in its comprehensiveness perhaps atones for the almost complete neglect of Hobbes by recent historians of literary criticism.

Mr Thorpe begins by sketching aesthetic theory prior to Hobbes, from Plato to Bacon, and shows how two questions had become urgent, the one as to the nature of the imagination and the other as to the aesthetic effect. Two important chapters are devoted to the consideration of Hobbes's views on these matters, and a third deals with the critical essays mentioned above, namely, the *Answer to Davenant* and the *Virtues of an Heroic Poem*. Mr Thorpe then proceeds to consider Hobbes's influence on others, first on his disciples Davenant and Charleton, then on Dryden, John Dennis, Cowley, John Locke and certain lesser writers. A final chapter summarizing the argument and attempting to estimate the true value of Hobbes's contribution concludes a well-planned and balanced work.

According to Hobbes, the ultimate explanation of artistic activity lies not in divine inspiration, nor in Platonic 'madness', nor again in blind obedience to any traditional set of rules, but solely in the activity of the imagination. Imagination itself must be explained in terms of sensation (which is in turn explained in terms of physiological and physical motion). Imagination is 'decaying sense', and in its simplest form is just memory. But there also exists a 'compounded imagination', in which the mind is not guided directly by the memory in the ordering of its sense-derived materials, but orders them itself in accordance with certain associations which it has observed in the course of its experience. The more alert and quick the intelligence, the readier the associating and comparing; and one mark of artistic genius is this power of quickly apprehending likenesses, which at first duller minds fail to observe. There are some passages in Hobbes which suggest that this is the sole mark of genius, but there are others (with which Mr Thorpe more readily concurs) in which Hobbes asserts that together with such quick-wittedness must also go a corrective and disciplining judgement. The fancy must be set a term and a limit lest it become too fanciful.

What this gifted and yet disciplined artist creates will be found pleasing

to the imagination and delightful to the mind. Hobbes eschews all objective criteria and accepts as the final criterion of artistic achievement the presence or absence of one effect, namely, imaginative pleasure. By its freshness and novelty the great poem enlivens the mind, by its judgement it nourishes it. There is no suggestion that the task of the artist and of the poet is to purify the emotions, as with Aristotle. Even tragedy is great art only in so far as it pleases, on the one hand by its novelty and on the other by affording us a quickened sense of our own security. The aim of the artist must be to awaken and to heighten the pleasurable emotions.

The emphasis on the subjective rather than on the objective in this argument will be patent, and Mr Thorpe is right in finding here one of the influences contributing to the new psychological, as opposed to the formal, approach in the literary criticism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. 'It was no small thing to substitute for the traditional neo-classic theory which regarded the external object as a source for imitation (guided though the artist might be by an *idea* of beautiful form by which to fashion his ideal) a conception of creation by powers of mind from its own stored experience made available through memory' (p. 294). It certainly was not. And some part of the credit (if *credit* is the right word) for this substitution goes to Hobbes. But where I find it difficult to follow Mr Thorpe is in the subsequent development of his argument. The part which poetry is to play in human life is serious and important, and Hobbes, unlike Locke, does not regard it as 'entertainment' merely. This can be admitted, but is Mr Thorpe right in supposing further that for Hobbes poetry is itself, like science, a means of attaining truth? 'What the philosopher attains by slow and laborious steps, the poet reaches quickly.... Poetry thus becomes... one of the legitimate and highly reputable modes of mind by which 'man finds his way to, and expresses, truth' (p. 302). Would Hobbes accept this? Mr Thorpe rests his case almost entirely, so far as I can see, on a passage in the *Answer to Davenant*, which I should not interpret in precisely the same way as he does. But even though Mr Thorpe's interpretation be correct, over against this passage lies the whole body of Hobbes's philosophy. There were writers in Hobbes's day no doubt who objected to the arrogant claims and the exclusiveness of the new scientific positivism. But surely Hobbes himself cannot be reckoned amongst their number. Certainly the poet can be philosopher and certainly the mind of the great poet is disciplined. But would Hobbes claim, or even admit, that the poet has *his* way to truth, other than the way of the philosopher or scientist?

R. I. AARON.

ABERYSTWYTH.

The Imaginary Voyage in Prose Fiction. A History of Its Criticism and a Guide for Its Study, with an Annotated Check List of 215 Imaginary Voyages from 1700 to 1800. By PHILIP BABCOCK GOVE. (*Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature*, 152.) New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1941. xi+445 pp. 23s. 6d.

Mr Gove's book, as his descriptive sub-title makes clear, is divided into two distinct pieces of research and tabulation. The first 178 pages are a documented record of the history of criticism of the Imaginary Voyage. For practical purposes, it starts with de Moncrief's hostile mention before the French Academy in 1741 and continues to our own day. There is new information about Garnier's huge collection of *Voyages Imaginaires, Songes, Visions, et Romans Cabalistiques* (36 volumes, Amsterdam and Paris, 1787-9) and about the work of Presley and Paludan. The various definitions of the Imaginary Voyage are set out and discussed, more particularly those of the Tiejies, Atkinson and Eddy, and all are shown to have their shortcomings. Indeed, Mr Gove is forced to conclude that the Imaginary Voyage overlaps with so many types of fiction that no final inclusive and exclusive definition is possible. Certain qualifications for the type there are: a full treatment and a narrative form, a voyage of distance and duration, landfall and discovery, fiction not fact the basis—and certain disqualifications: voyaging in dreams, voyaging by means of spirits and demons, by magic and metamorphosis, voyaging solely to the lands of the dead; while fiction which treats of well-known and well-authenticated expeditions is rather historical than geographical (Mr Gove sees the Imaginary Voyage as a division of what he calls geographical fiction, comparable in scope to historical fiction).

Part Two (pp. 179-402) is a list of publications in this kind of writing. It is chronological and confined to one century—'Partly, I admit,' says the author, 'because life is short, but principally because that century is, as Professor Pons has called it, "l'âge d'or du voyage imaginaire".' Another professorial pronouncement may be allowed to add weight to the first part of this sentence. Said Professor Chinard of Garnier's collection: 'Je ne connais pas de lecture plus effarante et je ne crois pas que jamais on ait compilé une plus extraordinaire encyclopédie des inventions qui peuvent passer par la tête des hommes' (*L'Amérique et le rêve exotique*, p. 408). The list is chronological, and Mr Gove wisely abjures the un-availing intricacies of romanesque, marvellous, fantastic, extraordinary, satiric, realistic, allegorical, philosophical, and the like categories. For completeness it puts all its rivals out of court and testifies so strongly to Mr Gove's equipment for search and research that one regrets, while sympathizing with, the prudence which kept him clear of the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. There is necessarily a lack of balance between the two parts of his book, good though they are. The scope of the First Part is so much the wider.

For the most part Mr Gove has avoided discussion of the literary and philosophical values of the books he lists, but he has fashioned a handy tool for the historian of literature and of society in the eighteenth century. He offers an extensive documentation of the imitators of Defoe and Swift, adds a footnote to the history of taste, and a page to the history of criticism.

GWYN JONES.

ABERYSTWYTH.

The Secret of Pascal. By H. F. STEWART. Cambridge: University Press. 1941. x+108 pp. 5s.

In the days before the war, Hitler was accustomed to order a Pogrom whenever circumstances required that the attention of his people should be diverted away from potentially dangerous objects. Persecution of the Jesuits has served the same purpose often enough in French history to warn the reader of the *Provinciales* that he must look for an explanation of their appearance elsewhere than in the personal convictions of their author. It is a defect of Dr Stewart's first chapter, 'Pascal in debate', that (despite a note [p. 91] which shows his familiarity with these *coulisses*) his faith in Pascal's probity obtrudes itself too much. The *Provinciales* are not a series of extension lectures on probabilism, which Pascal never began to understand, but a satire, directed against the Jesuits, in which he used the *Théologie morale des Jésuites* in the same manner as Boileau used Juvenal, and Voltaire the *Toledot Jeschu*, and for an analogous purpose: as Dr Stewart says, in another connexion, 'No case; blacken plaintiff's attorney'.

Of Christian morality, as Pascal understood it, Dr Stewart writes in his second chapter: 'It is free from rule, or rather you make your own rules in accordance with the broad precepts laid down by the Lord.' I know nothing which could suggest such a conclusion, except Brunschvicg's misleading note to 'fragment 4' in his edition of the *Pensées*. Otherwise, this chapter gives a clear picture of the confusion of Pascal's thought in the field of ethics, and the aberrancies in his conduct to which this gave rise.

The third and last chapter, 'Pascal as Poet', makes out a strong case for believing that the 'secret of Pascal's appeal and of his great strength' is to be found in his literary qualities. An experimental printing of some of the *Pensées* in verse-form, in order to exhibit 'parallelism' etc., proves too much—*on n'est pas poète à si peu de frais*, and the phenomena themselves are more interesting as evidence of Pascal's psychology than as literary effects. But Dr Stewart's loving intimacy with the text has enabled him to throw into full relief the power and brilliance of expression which Pascal could nearly always find when he wanted them (though not, indeed, always at the first time of asking). It would have been pertinent to observe also how these advantages not infrequently mask defects of

dialectic; but Dr Stewart shows himself impatient of Nicole's modest and pedestrian analyses, and does not pursue the line of inquiry suggested by Paul Valéry's malicious inversion of '*le silence éternel*'. .

The connotations of the epithet '*lascif*' (p. 22) in the seventeenth century were pejorative, no doubt, but not (in Dr Stewart's sense) 'ugly'.

NIGEL ABERCROMBIE.

EXETER.

Benserade and his ballets de cour. By CHARLES I. SILIN. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1940. 435 pp. \$4 00.

In this 'Extra Volume xv' of the *Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages* Professor Silin brings a scholarly study of seventeenth-century French drama to a series which already contains a number of interesting volumes on this period. He has set himself a double task. The first half of the book constitutes a heavily documented but very readable life of Isaac Benserade, in which are discussed and corrected some inaccuracies and inexact impressions left by previous biographers. In the second part—a continuation of H. Prunière's work, published in 1914, on '*Le ballet de cour en France avant Benserade et Lully*'—the author makes a detailed study of Benserade's share in Court ballets produced between 1651 and 1681. Both parts of the book are enlivened by copious quotations from Benserade and from contemporary witnesses. Mr Silin delights in detail, and to the discussion of manifold minor problems of place and date he brings a scholarly scrupulousness. There are full and fully referenced footnotes and the whole study has evidently been carried out with the most meticulous thoroughness. Two minor slips are to be found: on p. 308, l. 12, '*deux*' is obviously a misprint for '*doux*', and it is apparently by inadvertence that the two stanzas beginning '*Il n'est rien de si grand dans toute la Nature*' given on p. 283 are repeated on p. 292. It does not seem certain that the verses quoted on p. 371 have any real value as evidence of the general attitude of the Court towards the Quarrel of the Ancients and the Moderns.

The book is valuable not only as a contribution to our knowledge of Benserade and his works, but for the light it throws on the entertainments organized at the Court of Louis XIV. What lavish display! What a fund of ingenuity expended on the arranging and mounting of these costly and elaborate pageants! No less challenging is the expenditure of ingenuity by the poet. Benserade's verses, so easy-flowing, so cleverly turned, so graceful in eulogy, so pungent in satire, contrive to disguise, even with their limited vocabulary, the exiguousness and monotony of the matter. His poetry, despite its copiousness and its expenditure of wit, leaves behind it, like the extravagant entertainments which the poet helped to furnish, the rather lugubrious impression of a *lendemain de fête*,

with guttering candles casting lurid gleams on yesternight's discarded finery.

F. C. ROE.

ABERDEEN.

The Epic in Nineteenth-Century France. A Study in Heroic and Humanitarian poetry from 'Les Martyrs' to 'Les Siècles Morts'. By HERBERT J. HUNT. Oxford: Blackwell. 1941. xiii + 446 pp. 25s.

This is a great book. I would apply to it in all seriousness the epithets with which Pip airily describes Mr Wopsle's 'Hamlet'—'massive and concrete'. Massive, because despite Dr Hunt's modest disclaimer, there is no chink in the structure through which a poetaster of the period can escape his vigilant eye; concrete, because the argument is supported and confirmed by facts. I do not say 'founded' on fact, because the *point de départ* is abstraction. This is sufficiently declared by the sub-title 'a study in heroic and humanitarian poetry' (by the by, I do not understand the 'and'). It is humanitarian poetry cast in heroic form). It must not, however, be assumed that massivity here means heaviness. Dr Hunt's immense learning is not oppressive. He writes pleasantly and easily—too easily perhaps; he lays himself open sometimes to the charge of an *abus des adjectifs*—and without a trace of pretention or pretence.

What does he mean by 'humanitarian poetry'? He means that poets and prose-writers who felt the itch to compose an epic sought their subject, not in national happenings, but in the chequered history of mankind, seen in the light of the Christian idea. Christian and Neo-Christian and Anti-Christian, each in turn takes up the tale; and as Professor Rudler says in his brilliant Preface,¹ 'La religion de l'humanité est une conception anti-chrétienne. Il n'en est pas moins vrai qu'en s'éloignant de lui l'épopée humanitaire continue à pousser dans le christianisme des racines profondes et diverses; par exemple, elle se centre souvent—à sa manière—sur le dogme de la Chute et de la Rédemption.' Indeed the theme may be reduced to the two parts into which Pascal divides his Apology: 'I, L'homme sans Dieu; II, L'homme avec Dieu.'

It is significant, and Dr Hunt duly notes it, that whereas the period under review, especially in its latter part, records repeated and increasing effort to depict man as struggling single-handed against the forces of evil, it ends as it began with belief in a divine co-operation. Hugo joins hands with Chateaubriand across the generation of Positivists. Although the curtain drops upon the depressing *Siècles morts* of A. de Guerne,² I think we may fairly class that author with his master, de Lisle, to whom he forms a kind of appendage, and regard 'Dieu' as the last word of nineteenth-century heroic endeavour. Indeed, the dross (and how much

¹ I cannot bring myself to write 'Foreword', which is a corrupt following of the German, imposed upon us by Freeman and Furnivall: 'Je condamnerais d'autorité, je bannirais, je proscrierais, peu s'en faut que je ne die j'exterminerai ce—"Foreword".'

² Why, if A. de Vigny and A. de Musset are rightly cited as Vigny and Musset, should A. de Guerne retain his particle and appear consistently as De Guerne?

there is of it!) is burned away and there remains in the crucible—Hugo, Victor in epic as well as in drama and romance.

It is quite impossible, within my present limits, to do anything like justice to Dr Hunt's erudition and patience. I content myself with noting that (1) he possesses a gift which all those who plunge into the *selva oscura* of the second-rate are very apt to lack, viz. discrimination. His geese are not all swans, nor his swans phoenixes, (2) he rescues from undeserved oblivion some interesting figures, e.g. Guerne, whom even Lanson omits from his Bibliography; Cailleux, who with his antediluvian experiment is one of the most original of the whole bazaar, and Viennet, who according to Dr Hunt was 'the poet most capable of composing a full-dress epic on the old orthodox lines', and (3) he fully justifies his claim to have furnished a missing chapter in French literary history. For all this he deserves our gratitude.

H. F. STEWART.

CAMBRIDGE.

André Maurois. By GEORGES LEMAÎTRE. Stanford University Press; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1939. 128 pp. 11s 6d.

Émile Salomon Wilhelm Herzog, otherwise André Maurois, must for long have been the French writer best known and most read by the general public in the Anglo-Saxon countries. To the British Maurois owed much: the experience which furnished him with the material for the delightful *Bramble* books, the subjects for his most successful biographies, the matter of an infinity of lectures and studies, and, so it would appear, an acceptable ideal of living. His reputation owed most to his British admirers and he was looked up to on both sides of the Channel as the very personification of the *Entente Cordiale*. The detached and somewhat ironic tone of his last book, *Why France Fell*, written from a safe retreat in the New World, seems to have come as an unpleasant shock to the admirers of this erstwhile Anglophile.

The professor of Romanic languages in Stanford University has produced a very workmanlike study of Maurois's life, Maurois's England, of the biographies and the novels, with a final chapter on the 'philosophy of life' which might perhaps have been more simply called his 'attitude to life'. Mr Lemaître's book is short, somewhat abstract in style, the judgements are sound and the strength and weakness of Maurois indicated with sympathetic insight. Undoubtedly Maurois's best work is in his writings on the English; as a novelist he does not rank with the great masters. He is infinitely dexterous, tells a story ingeniously and charmingly, but strong creative power is lacking, and no amount of analytic intelligence can replace it. In his biographies, as Mr Lemaître points out excellently, he succeeds fully only when he is, in fact, autobiographical. In them, as in his novels, he exploits his material with consummate skill,

concocting from the scholarly ponderous tomes compiled by the 'researchers' a delightful *Life*, light in texture as the ephemeral fiction beloved of the general reader. M. Maurois deserves to be a 'best-seller'. And this study will enable his large public to read him with a fuller understanding of the man and of his ideas.

F. C. ROE.

ABERDEEN.

Artistic Theory in Italy, 1450-1600. By ANTHONY BLUNT. London: Oxford University Press. 1940. 168 pp. 7s. 6d.

Mr Blunt provides a lucid survey of the changing attitude towards the arts down to the rise of mannerism, and a valuable background to help the individual appreciation. His field is from the rationalism of Alberti, who finds firm principles for art in the investigation of Nature, through Leonardo, who substitutes the characteristic for the beautiful as the artist's object, to Michaelangelo, with whom creative imagination tends to dwarf rationalism. Thence after the turmoil of the first half of the sixteenth century emerges the admiration of Vasari for Michaelangelo, and also his doctrine of gracefulness. What he desires is facility and sweetness, and his followers tend to seek their fixed principles in previous masters instead of in Nature. The Council of Trent banishes the nude—for Vasari the chief object of the artist's virtuosity—and subordinates art to theology once more. In these conditions Academic Eclecticism is born at the end of the century.

Such is the fairly well-known theme which Mr Blunt illustrates from the contemporary statements about art; and there is a happy sobriety in his scholarship. But there is a necessary limitation to it. Correggio, for instance, said nothing, and so finds no place in an account of theory. Other lacunae there are inevitably; and theory by itself can be dangerous since it does not necessarily correspond to performance. Mr Blunt insists on the medieval nature of post-Tridentine views on art, and is himself induced thereby (p. 106) to suggest similarity between the mannerists and the artists of the medieval Church. Yet the temper of the two periods is perfectly distinct, and for reasons which can be deduced from Mr Blunt's own narrative. There is a question, too, as to Mr Blunt's completeness. He finds space, quite rightly, to dismiss works which have no contribution of their own to make, and might perhaps have added as an appendix those without any value at all. I am quite willing to imagine that writers like Campi, Alessandro Allori, Porzio, Filandro, Monsignori, Rusconi or the various manuals on perspective are without originality; but an authoritative statement from one who has had time to review the whole field would assist the student. Do Aretino's letters throw any light on Titian's practice? Did Dürer, apart from his direct influence on style, contribute anything by his treatise on symmetry in the human body, twice printed in Italian during this period? These are small points. More important is the question of the opening chapter. To begin with Alberti

without attaching him to the trend of humanism is to be a little in the air. Thus there should be no room for surprise (p. 11) at the lack of theological preoccupations in Alberti, since he does not derive from the medieval writers on art, but from Petrarch and humanism. With this, too, is involved the change in the artist's status (ch. iv). Petrarch abandons speculative thought for moral philosophy. He sets up virtue as our main business, but he is still sufficiently medieval to think of virtue as a matter of the mind against the body. Those who follow him develop the concept virtue and translate it in terms of social activity. They give logical effect to Petrarch's Ciceronian gratitude for the passage from the necessary arts to the more elegant ones. Petrarch's classification of the arts into liberal, which concern the mind, and mechanical ones, which concern the body, is no longer valid. Valla, who refutes the renunciatory attitude of the *De Remedius* towards the arts, nevertheless only gives a *proxime accessus* to the arts proper, as opposed to the liberal arts. It is left for Alberti to complete the process, and to give the title of *buone arti* to the professions, including in the term merchants, doctors and musicians. He maintains that the painter needs talents of the same order as the historian. That is why, with his own manifold activity, the artist can reappear, transformed, on a new footing of equality with the man of letters.

Finally, there are a few points open to query. The idea (p. 18) of Alberti as choosing the typical is not borne out by the evidence quoted. His measurements are from individuals chosen as most beautiful, and his average derived from them. That depends on an original judgement, and what is typical of beauty is not *necessarily* typical in Nature. That destroys the contrast Mr Blunt sees between the matter-of-fact Alberti and Michaelangelo. Condivi's statement about the latter (pp. 61-2) is identical, not contrasting, and this is one of the many cases where explicit theory is not sufficient to explain artistic content. Again, the epithet *gentlemanly* for the reliefs on Giotto's Campanile (p. 55) is misplaced. It could have meant nothing to Giotto himself, who was not indulging in the later polemic on the status of the artist. The discussion on the two Adams of Michaelangelo is not cogent (p. 65). The essential difference is one of theme: the fallen Adam at the moment of judgement is no longer the potential inheritor of the universe. From the obvious contrast between the two the idea that Michaelangelo had lost interest in physical beauty can no more be drawn than the notion that his hand was failing. What of the Christ in the same Last Judgement? But the few omissions, and the few places where one may be inclined to disagree with Mr Blunt's conclusions, must not alter the good impression which the work produces. Rather, it is to be hoped that Mr Blunt will find the opportunity when he is released from active service to write the complementary critique of Italian art in the same period. In that he will have the advantage of not being limited to the comparative few who state an attitude towards the arts:

J. H. WHITFIELD.

Cuatro Comedias. Edited with notes and vocabulary by JOHN M. HILL and MABEL MARGARET HARLAN. New York: Norton. 1941. viii + 699 pp. \$4.25.

The four comedias printed are Lope's *Peribáñez*, Tirso's *Burlador*, Alarcón's *No hay mal que por bien no venga*, and Calderón's *No siempre lo peor es cierto*. They are designed to furnish a sufficient impression of the Spanish classical theatre in works representative of the four great dramatists. The vocabulary and notes are suited to school and university use, but the texts are established with more care than is usually lavished on such works. In each case photostats have been used to give the best authenticated texts. The play chosen from Alarcón's repertoire is somewhat unexpected. The editor's purpose is to illustrate not merely the moral seriousness of that author but also his *vis comica*. Each play is prefaced by a short note on the characteristics of the author as illustrated by the piece chosen. The preface to Tirso's *Burlador* might profitably have been longer. It is so difficult, in view of the dearth and weakness of Spanish criticism, to invest a literary work with intellectual interest, that the *Burlador*, with its copious literature, is a welcome instrument for the teacher, though artistically so faulty. Both as to source and intention the student could have made use of more information than the editors have provided.

The date assigned to *Peribáñez* is 1604, when Lope de Vega was 42 years of age. This is inferred from the lines

PERIBÁÑEZ. ¿Tendréis tres dieces y un nueve?
BELARDO. Esos y otros tres....

While it is very natural to suppose that *años* is the term to be supplied, is it far-fetched to suggest that *tres dieces...y otros tres* might imply *dieces*, making the speaker 69? The speaker is *viejo* and of *caduca edad*, grey or white-haired (*cayó un año mucha nieve*), and too old for dancing with the girls (*ya no soy para ellas*), all of which suits an age well over 42. The phrase *A la iglesia me acogí* could be associated with the word *sacristán*, shortly preceding, implying that a sudden greying caused Belardo to take cover with the Church by becoming the parish sacristan. The mystification about Belardo's age makes it a criterion of little reliability for fixing the date of the play.

As for *No siempre lo peor es cierto*, it might have been worth while to notice the symmetry of perplexities suffered by the characters. These are either double or quadruple. Thus one gets paradoxes like *si airado una vez, si tierno otra vez* (line 562) and *tú ofendiendo yo amparando* (2692), which are double relations, and also the quadruple ones; such as Don Juan's

Y yo, de todos prendado,
no sé a qué me determino:
de Leonor, porque es mujer;
de vos, porque sois mi primo;
por el Marqués, de don Pedro;
y de mi honor, por mí mismo (1662).

and Beatriz's

me hallo
obligada a ser yo misma
tercera de mis agravios
y cómplice de mis celos (2426).

It is not psychology, but a kind of chess-board movement of psychological pawns. With each turn in the action the personages are found redistributed in symmetrical groupings connected by interestingly conflicting motives. The play also throws some light on the honour motif. Don Pedro accepts very easily a far from plausible explanation as to how his daughter came to be in a young bachelor's house (2629), but Don Carlos obstinately demands concrete evidence of a thing likely in itself (1434):

DON JUAN. He llegado a persuadirme,
aunque el indicio la culpa,
que ella está, Carlos, sin culpa.
DON CARLOS. Poco tenéis que decirme
en eso; pero aunque yo
el desengaño deseo,
mientras no lo toco y veo,
¿tengo de creelle?

In other words, it would seem that the famous code was variable enough, and adapted primarily to the dramatist's convenience. Were it true that an insult could be washed away in blood, the wounding of Don Diego before the play begins would have made any other action unnecessary.

W. J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

Der arme Heinrich, a Poem by Hartman von Ouwe. Edited by J. KNIGHT BOSTOCK. Oxford: Basil Blackwell. 1941. viii + 114 pp. 6s.

This is the first volume of a series of German medieval texts issued under the general editorship of Professor H. G. Fiedler. Dr Bostock states that his book is intended for students beginning their study of Middle High German. It fulfils its purpose in every way. But since there are frequent references in the notes to books and articles dealing with the poem, even the advanced student will find all he needs.

The book falls into three parts. The introduction consists of a select bibliography containing forty-four entries (pp. 1-4), a sketch of the author's life and works (pp. 6-10), his language and style (pp. 10-13), the source and moral purpose of the poem (pp. 14-19), the metre (pp. 20-25). The text and notes follow (pp. 27-90). The last part is the vocabulary (pp. 91-114). Dr Bostock has wisely cut out of his introduction practically all the guess-work which has been published on the author's life and his home. The student is told where he can read this for himself. One misses, however, in the bibliography the edition of the poem by the late Professor J. G. Robertson, published towards the end of the last century, and the contribution to the source in Margaret D. Howie's *Studies in the Use of Exempla* (London, 1923).

The text is that of the critical edition of Erich Gierach. Where Gierach's emendations are particularly doubtful (e.g. ll. 391, 546) attention has been drawn to them in the notes. Dr Bostock's own work is to be seen principally in the notes and vocabulary. Students will thank him for giving all the explanatory matter in footnotes to the text, so that they are saved from a constant turning of pages. The notes are excellent. Even the beginner should be able to read the poem with the minimum of help from a teacher. Both in the notes and in the vocabulary full information is given on changes in the meanings of words from Middle High German to Modern German. The reader's attention is called to Franz Saran's excellent rendering of the poem into Modern German prose.

A few suggestions may perhaps be made. In line 584 'in leider loch', to which is given a long note, could be made clearer to the English reader by reference to the popular phrase 'a better 'ole'. In line 1010 'sî gerten keines dankes dô' room might have been found for the very old suggestion that a new paragraph should begin with this verse, so that the sense would be 'they desired no thanks, but at last Lord Heinrich thanked all three of them'. The vocabulary gives only 'thought, purpose, will' as the meaning of 'danc', which suggests, wrongly, that it can never mean 'thanks' in Middle High German. Riemer's interpretation of the verse, which Dr Bostock adopts without hesitation, is not fully convincing. In lines 1434-5 'und warte sinem gebote / baz dan er ê tæte' the subjunctive 'tæte' is explained as used for the sake of rime (stæte), or as introducing a slight unreality. These explanations are not necessary. The subjunctive is normal in a comparative sentence after 'dan', preceded by a positive sentence (Paul, *Mhd. Gr.* § 368).

The book is beautifully printed. It is a pity that English publishers do not always issue Modern German texts printed in such excellent type.

A. C. DUNSTAN.

SHEFFIELD.

Corona. Studies in Celebration of the Eightieth Birthday of Samuel Singer, Professor Emeritus, University of Berne, Switzerland. Edited by ARNO SCHIROKAUER and WOLFGANG PAULSEN. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press. 1941. 282 pp. \$4.00.

Under the editorship of Professors Schirokauer and Paulsen, and under the sponsorship of the German department of South Western, Memphis, Tennessee, a handsomely got-up miscellany has been offered to a Swiss scholar whose fame has become almost legendary by his friends and former students in the United States. Its contents reflect the many-sided interests of Singer himself. The first few articles are concerned with folk-lore. Professor Archer Taylor discusses the ancient comparison of the human body and its members with a house and its parts. Professor Senn traces various motifs and parallels of the Lithuanian tale of Gilše, showing how Polish was the vehicle for the transmission to the Baltic

peoples of Central and West European lore. Next comes a bibliography of proverb literature since 1920 with useful notes by Professor Jente. German literature then makes its entry with an edition of a hitherto unpublished 'Pritschmeisterspruch' entitled *Von dem schiessen zu Augspurg* 1509. According to the editor, Professor Sell, the author on his own showing is a Hans Werthmann or Wordtmann, a glazier of Schwabisch Hall. This article is followed by Miss Hatcher's well-documented semantic discussion of Old French *son cors**, cf. M.H.G. *mîn lîp*, E. *anybody*, etc. Professor Weidmann has made a close statistical study of the orthography of the Manesse manuscript to see to what extent the components of nominal compounds are 'conflated' in writing, e.g. *himmelvart*, and finds that the writing together of compounds was already established in principle—especially in the case of those most frequently used—in the M.H.G. period. This philological article is followed by a penetrating discussion by Professor Spitzer of contemporary French neologisms with the prefix *para-*, e.g. *paramilitaire*, and with the suffixes—*aire*, e.g. *moscoutaire*, *-ard*, e.g. *stavisquard*, etc. Schirokauer himself next gives a substantial contribution to the discussion of the second Merseburg charm, taking up once again the problem of *Phol* and *Balderes volo*, both of which he brings into relation with the 'Sonnenwagen', and then going on to *zi holza varan* and the rest of the charm and its organization. Dr von Grunebaum's article on the development of the type of scholar in early Islam will appeal to students of Arabic, as will also Dr Ecker's discussion of the descriptions of flowers by the Spanish Arabian court-poets.

The last 124 pages are devoted to German literature. Professor Nordmeyer goes fully into the question of the authenticity of the poem ascribed by *Minnesangs Frühling*, 176, 5 to Reinmar von Hagenau and comes to the conclusion that it is not only a genuine poem, but also one of the most valuable of all Reinmar's poems. Walter von der Vogelweide's poem on the Emperor Otto's honour (Walther, 26, 33) is discussed by Professor Sperber, who would interpret *êre* as though it were in quotation marks, i.e. used derisively. In the next article no less a writer than Thomas Mann treats with affectionate care and with many subtle observations Goethe's *Werther*—the article may be, as the dust cover of the miscellany suggests, an introduction to his latest novel, *Lotte in Weimar*. After Goethe comes Clemens Brentano, whose *Geschichte vom braven Kasperl und schönen Annerl* is subjected to a thorough structural analysis by Professor Feise, and according to him shows a mode of construction traceable further in Arnim's story *Der tolle Invalid* and Raabe's *Else von der Tanne* and *Des Reiches Krone* among others. Next comes Hegel, who admittedly derived certain ideas for his treatment of dialectic and irony from Solger's works, of which the principal is *Erwin, Vier Gespräche über das Schöne und die Kunst* (1815). Professor Mueller gives a useful account of Solger's life and teachings and shows what Hegel learnt from him.

Like his co-editor, Professor Paulsen has contributed one of the most

substantial articles in the collection. It discusses Stifter's fascinating novel *Der Nachsommer* in relation to his own life and his maturing attitude. The self-denial inculcated in this work is said to have had for Stifter not only an aesthetic, but also a religious value, ultimately traceable to the Benedictine spirit of Kremsmünster. Paulsen defines the scope of the terms 'bourgeois' and 'Biedermeier' in their application to Stifter. To him the *Nachsommer* marks the confluence of catholic romanticism and Goethe's classicism. Another literary essay of great interest is Dr L. Kahn's contrast between Gustav Freytag and Wilhelm Raabe in regard to their attitude to progress and 'Kultur'. The author gives a sympathetic picture of Raabe in particular. The volume concludes with an analysis by Dr Francine Bradley of some early lyrics by the Alsatian Schickele showing how symbolistic features emerge even in his naturalistic writing. Readers of the *Modern Language Review* will desire to be associated in sending their best wishes to 'der Alte Singer', who, they hope, is still going strong.

W. E. COLLINSON.

LIVERPOOL.

An Anthology of German Poetry, 1880-1940. By JETHRO BITHELL.
London Methuen. 1941. lix+259 pp 7s. 6d. net.

This anthology, we learn from the preface, was inspired by the Higher Certificate Examination, and the choice of poems was governed partly by what boys and girls seemed to Mr Bithell as examiner-compiler to like, and partly by his desire that they should be introduced to the secrets of 'Motivik' and the delight of studying poetry as a science ('as much a matter of cold classification as entomology'). In spite of this complexity, or confusion, of inspiration, I should like to say, before I advance my chief criticism, that as a selection from the modern German lyric it is a very fair piece of work. The choice is wide and various (sixty-six poets are represented), and though there are many bad poems in it, and many dull ones, and though many attractive possibilities are omitted, there are nevertheless very many good poems. Moreover, Mr Bithell has performed some of the more difficult parts of his task with great success. To take two examples: the selection from Dehmel is so good as to make him appear, one might almost say, a better poet than he was; whilst that from George, the most difficult of all to select from, is excellent.

Why then did Mr Bithell give us with his anthology this crammed and choppy introduction? It suits neither the selection nor the intended educational function of the book. For the selection would have to be much larger, or the introduction much less compendious, for the two to fit each other; whilst the association of details of quite subordinate figures and trends of literary history with an elementary apparatus of aids to the study and appreciation of verse is incongruous—whoever needs the one doesn't need the other. What does Mr Bithell expect sixth-formers—

'our *Primaner*' he calls them in a bi-lingual style that is jolly and un-ashamed—to make of the following passage (p. xx)?

The mentality of German poets was profoundly affected by the psychological minuteness of Dostoevsky and the religious fervour of Tolstoy in his later phase. French poetry—always closely followed in Germany as everywhere else—had evolved from the satanic *nouveaux frissons* of Baudelaire and the Parnassians' pregnant compression of the spirit of history to the subtle spirit music of Verlaine and the delicate suggestiveness of the symbolists; and German poetry shaped itself on these phases and movements, but mostly in the second iconoclastic stage of impressionism, while the first stage, naturalism, took over the critical doctrines of Taine and Zola—according to the one literature is a product of ingredients, just as chemistry is, and according to the other it is a matter of collecting 'documents' or data in the scientist's way; this gives the lie to the old romantic conception of poetry as the gift of God to his chosen mouthpiece, who is therefore divine, and substitutes the ideal of the poet as the self-ordained teacher of the masses and the prophet calling for a new world-order.

This is a fair sample from the sixty-page introduction; indeed there are many passages, too long for quotation, where sense and relevance are quite obscure even for a 'scholar', let alone a sixth-former (e.g. p. xviii, p. xxviii, p. xxxi, etc.). I do not know who will read this with profit; and it is not usefully arranged for handy reference. Have we nicely got over the etymological assiduity of Pitt Press notes, only to plunge into a new pedantry: text-book literary history, detailed, compressed, unselective, presented as an aid to education and the understanding of poetry? The instinct of teachers and scholars may well warn them against this introduction and teach them contempt for the academic authority with which it is put forward. As a selection of poems the book fills a gap creditably. What a menace its introduction holds in connexion with the examination that inspired it!

R. PEACOCK.

LEEDS.

SHORT NOTICES

The latest issue of that invaluable guide to research, *Work in Progress*, 1941. In the *Modern Humanities* (Edited by James M. Osborn and David R. Kerr. May 1941. Bulletin No. 19 A. Modern Humanities Research Association. 181 pp. Issued free to members) bears the mark of the times. The claims of the search for truth, in England above all, but increasingly in America too, have been subordinated to the needs of a war to preserve freedom and truth in the world. As for the countries which are no longer free, research in the humanities is in abeyance there. The study of Heine or of Mann is pursued, not in Germany, but in America. A cheerful and useful item in this report is the long list, covering over two close-printed pages, of projects of work now completed since the last report (pp. v–vii). It is most satisfactory to see how many scholars are giving their time to the arduous task of compiling biblio-

ographies, of which the excellent index shows fifty-three. And the biographical projects are numerous indeed, and show some overlapping of effort and the value of this report, in this as in so many ways.

Professor R. W. Chambers is shown (p. 19 and Index) as 'Sir R. W. Chambers'. One may wonder if, on p. 24, 'Saul A. Tannenbaum' is an error for 'Samuel'. But the entries, so numerous and so widespread, show admirable accuracy and care, especially in present difficulties. One cannot express too highly one's gratitude to Mr Osborn and Mr Kerr for this gift to scholarship and for this selfless devotion. Why is *their* work not entered in *Work in Progress*? We trust it will be possible to continue the work upon the same comprehensive basis and to avoid isolation.

C. J. Sisson.

LONDON.

In *Ronald Brunlees McKerrow, 1872-1940 (Proceedings of the British Academy. Vol. xxvi. London: H. Milford. 1941. 29 pp. 2s. 6d.)* Dr W. W. Greg has paid tribute to an old friend and colleague with such personal knowledge and scholarly discrimination as he alone could command. Dr Greg is as generous as he is just and judicious in his account of the man and the scholar whose death last year left so great a gap among us.

It is not given to any but to a man of stature to leave such monuments as McKerrow's *Nashe*, his *Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students*, his *Review of English Studies*, and his great share in *The Library*. The spread of interest among London University students in bibliographical studies, due to the lectures of A. W. Pollard and McKerrow at King's College, and of W. W. Greg at University College with its Elizabethan Press, now unhappily destroyed, shows how the presence of such a group of masters may create a school out of which their successors may yet emerge.

The happiest relations subsisted between this journal and McKerrow's *Review*, and we take this opportunity of offering a friendly greeting to his successor in the editorship of McKerrow's much loved intellectual child.

Of the man himself it is difficult to speak, as even Dr Greg, a lifelong friend, admits. Reticent and modest as was McKerrow, and slow to accept the high estimate in which all held him who knew him, he sought certainties and proofs which are not always attainable in the studies to which he devoted himself, and was reluctant to venture beyond these limits. So Dr Greg observes, and it was part of the man's nature. The excellent portrait which forms a frontispiece to Dr Greg's British Academy memoir is characteristic, and very welcome.

C. J. Sisson.

LONDON.

Professor F. P. Wilson's Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy for 1941, upon *Shakespeare and the Diction of Common Life* (*Proceedings of the British Academy*. Vol. xxvii. London: Humphrey Milford. 1941. 33 pp. 2s 6d.) is both scholarly and delightful, and will repay the closest attention. The recent revival of the study of Shakespeare's living language is here shown at its best as a true guide to interpretation. It is strange that so little attention has been given in our University schools of English to the development of modern English and in particular to Tudor English. Yet philology could give no greater service, and no more necessary training, to the student. There is much to be said for what might fairly be called the Kittredge School of exegesis, as compared with more high-flying Shakespearian studies. And Professor Wilson gives some excellent examples of words which have changed their colour as deeply as words vary as between, say, French and English, though of the same spelling.

He has some comment to make upon the nexus of images in Shakespeare's writing, and pays tribute to such pioneer work, half-forgotten, as that of Walter Whiter's *Specimen of a Commentary* (1794). Proverbs make a fruitful theme of discussion. Professor Wilson might well have cited the illuminating popularity of the ironical 'thought is free', with its political significance. Once more the comparison of Shakespeare with Ben Jonson, in respect of diction, throws light on both (p. 23 and Note D). Altogether the lecture is packed with interesting matter, and there is an appendix of Notes, including full notes on Whiter and on 'Dr Story's cap' and Tyburn. I observe a dropped type in 'col ective' (p. 23).

C. J. SISSON.

LONDON.

Observations upon a late Libel, called A Letter from a Person of Quality to his Friend, concerning the King's Declaration (Cambridge: University Press. 1941. 51 pp. 3s. 6d.) is a copy of a pamphlet found by Mr Hugh Macdonald in Trinity College Library and edited by him. As its title indicates, it is an anonymous defence of Charles II's declaration of the causes which led him to dissolve the Oxford Parliament in 1681 and its predecessor at Westminster, and an attack on the Whig pamphlet mentioned in the title. Mr Macdonald argues that the manuscript ascription of the pamphlet to the Earl of Halifax is the right one, and this gives him the occasion for a useful introduction in which he recalls the political excitement of 1681. I have no doubt that Mr Macdonald has proved Halifax's authorship; it has the stamp of his caustic wit and homely illustration. It now takes the earliest place in Halifax's sheaf of political pamphlets, the famous *Letter to a Dissenter* being next in time (1687). Mr Macdonald also provides a bibliography of the Earl's works.

GEORGE KITCHIN.

EDINBURGH.

In the volume of *Studies for William A. Read* (University, La.: Louisiana State University Press. 1940. x+338 pp. \$4.50) those in the Language section are worth more than those listed under Literature. There are three interesting articles: 'The Phonemes of Current English' (Kemp Malone), 'Zur Palatalisierung im Romanischen' (Ernst Gamillscheg) and 'The Naming of Women by the Continental Germans' (Henry Bosley Woolf). The finest contribution is that by Albert C. Baugh, an account of Thomas Jefferson's interest in Old English and the effect that interest had on his opinions in current linguistic questions. The excellent construction and sound writing of the article are in keeping with the worth of its subject-matter. W. P. Shepard's article on a song, hitherto unpublished, of the troubadour Aimeric de Péguhan must be mentioned and the economy of its presentation admired, the more so because in many of the contributions to this book economy has not been observed.

Of the studies in the Literature section, Robert B. Heilman's vindication of Goldsmith's play *The Goodnatured Man* from the charge of sentimentality is perhaps the best. The comparison of the theme of the play with the argument of Goldsmith's essay 'On Justice and Generosity' is a pertinent one. One wishes, however, that the compound 'desentimentalize' had not found harbour in an essay on literature. One regrets more that the book contains an article in which statements are made about 'Shakespeare's melancholy' and Shakespeare's characters which cannot be maintained.

W. M. T. DODDS.

OXFORD.

In *The Comédie Française, 1680-1701. Plays, Actors, Spectators. Finances* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; London: H. Milford. 1941. 210 pp. \$3.00), Professor H. C. Lancaster has attempted to give a summary of the information contained in the *Registres* of the Comédie Française which should supplement the extracts published by La Grange, the frères Parfaict, Bonnassies, Monval, Couet and Joannidès. To the list cited by Professor Lancaster might be added, for the performances of Corneille, Molière and Racine up to 1870, the tables compiled for the *Grands Écrivains* editions by Eugène Despois.

Professor Lancaster provides more details than his predecessors, who usually contented themselves with the number of performances of a given play in a year. To this he adds the month in which each performance took place, the actors' and author's receipts when available, and an estimate of the number of spectators. Obviously it is impossible to cover more than a limited period on this generous scale, and it is interesting to note that the present work, which takes only the years 1680-1701, occupies nearly one hundred pages more than the Joannidès *Tableau*, which covers the period 1680-1920.

This information is undoubtedly valuable for the literary historian and has been rather unjustly neglected by him. Despois was already conscious

of this when in 1873 he spoke of the *Registres* as 'trop rarement consultés peut-être' and, in referring to his own work, he adds significantly: 'Tout ce travail n'aboutit qu'à quelques colonnes de chiffres; mais si nous sommes fort loin de nous faire un mérite de l'avoir entrepris et mené à fin, nous croyons en pouvoir signaler l'importance: ces chiffres ont du moins une signification précise, et qui ne saurait être indifférente, au double point de vue de la littérature et de l'histoire.'

A statement which was already true of Despois's tables acquires even greater significance when applied to the far more extensive data collected by Professor Lancaster. Here is material for many interesting monographs. We hope that the author will be able to fulfil his plan of continuing the lists for the years which follow 1701.

L. A. BISSON.

OXFORD.

In fulfilment of the conditions of the Willard Fiske trust, Mr Halldór Hermannsson has now produced the thirty-eighth volume of *Islandica: Illuminated Manuscripts of the Jónsbók* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1940. (8) + 26 pp. and 30 plates. \$2). This is in fact a continuation of his earlier work, *Icelandic Illuminated Manuscripts of the Middle Ages*, of which he gives a convenient summary before proceeding to the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century MSS. with which he is here mainly concerned. It is sufficiently interesting that, so long after the invention of printing, the Icelandic taste for beautiful books should have produced so many illuminated MSS. of a legal code, but of equal interest in one way is the distinguishing of the various strains of stylistic influence, including that of the decoration of printed books, and in another the information about identifiable scribes and illuminators (pp. 17-23) and the owners of MSS. (pp. 21-22 n.). The most amusing single detail is the gradual ageing of St Olav and of the monster at his feet which 'generally grows old with him', but there are other matters which, as Mr Hermannsson points out, are not only of interest from the point of view of art, but are also of great importance for the history of Icelandic manners and customs. The illustrations of these in *Reykjabók* (AM. 345 fol.) are particularly noteworthy, and there are several reproductions among the plates.

EDITH C. BATHO.

LONDON.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

July-September 1941

With the collaboration of PAMELA GRADON (English)

GENERAL

WARD, I. C., *Ibo Dialects and the Development of a Common Language*. Cambridge, Heffer. 1s. 6d.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES

French.

BAUDIN, M., *The Profession of King in Seventeenth-Century French Drama*. Johns Hopkins and Oxford Univ. Presses. \$1.25.

GRUBBS, H. A., *Jean-Baptiste Rousseau. His Life and Works*. Princeton and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s. 6d.

NILSSON-EHLE, H., *Les adverbes en '-ment' compléments d'un verbe en français moderne*. Lund, Gleerup. 10 Sw. kr.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES

English.

(a) *General (including linguistic).*

BURKE, K., *The Philosophy of Literary Form*. Louisiana, State Univ. Press. \$3.

SAMPSON, G., *The Concise Cambridge History of English Literature*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 15s.

WILSON, R. A., *The Miraculous Birth of Language*. London, Dent. 1s.

(b) *Old and Middle English.*

Anglo-Norman Letters and Petitions from All Souls MS. 182, ed. by M. D. Legge. Oxford, Blackwell. £3. 3s.

SMALLEY, B., *The Story of the Bible in the Middle Ages*. Oxford, Clarendon Press; London, H. Milford. 17s. 6d.

(c) *Modern English.*

ADDISON, J., *The Letters of*, ed. by Walter Graham. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 30s.

ARMSTRONG, M., *Trelawny. A Man's Life*. London, Hale. 15s.

BRADBROOK, M. C., *Joseph Conrad*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 3s. 6d.

CHESTERTON, Mrs Cecil, *The Chestertons*. London, Chapman and Hall. 12s. 6d.

CHURCH, R., *Eight for Immortality. Critical Studies of W. H. Davies, Walter de la Mare, Robert Frost, Yeats, Edmund Blunden*. V. Sackville-West, T. S. Eliot and Robert Graves. London, Dent. 6s.

COOPER, L., *Methods and Aims in the Study of Literature* (Cornell Stud. in Engl. xxxi). Cornell and Oxford Univ. Presses. 9s. 6d.

DAVIES, Sir John, *The Poems of*, reproduced in Facsimile from the first editions in the Henry E. Huntington Library and Art Gallery. Introd. and Notes by C. Howard. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 20s.

- DONNE, J., *Ignatius his Conclave*, reproduced in facsimile from the edition of 1611 with an introduction by C. M. Coffin. For the Facsimile Text Society. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 10s. 6d.
- DRAYTON, M., *The Works of*, ed. by J. W. Hebel, K. Tillotson and B. H. Newdigate. Vol. v. Introduction, Notes, Variants. Oxford, Blackwell, for the Shakespeare Head Press. £8. 18s. 6d. the set of 5 vols.
- Golden Treasury, The*, ed. by F. T. Palgrave with additional Poems. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 2s. 6d.
- GREGG, W. W., *Ronald Brunlees McKerrow, 1872-1940*. London, H. Milford, for the British Academy. 2s. 6d.
- JONSON, B., *The Works of*, ed. by C. H. Herford, P. and E. Simpson. Vol. VII, *The Sad Shepherd; The Fall of Mortimer; Masques and Entertainments*. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 35s.
- KING, A. H., *The Language of satirized Characters in Poetaster*. Lund, Gleerup; London, Williams and Norgate. 10 Sw. kr.
- McLACHLAN, H., *The Religious Opinions of Milton, Locke, and Newton*. Manchester, Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.
- NEWDIGATE, B. H., *Michael Drayton and his Circle*. Oxford, Blackwell, for the Shakespeare Head Press. 15s.
- POE, E. A., *Tamerlane and other Poems*, reproduced in facsimile from the edition of 1827 with an introduction by T. O. Mabbott. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 12s.
- QUENNELL, P., *Byron in Italy*. London, Collins. 12s. 6d.
- RETINGER, J. H., *Conrad and his Contemporaries*. Minerva Publishing Company. 5s.
- WILSON, F. P., *Shakespeare and the Diction of Common Life. Annual Shakespeare Lecture of the British Academy, 1941*. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 2s. 6d.
- WOOLF, V., *Between the Acts*. London, Hogarth Press. 7s. 6d.

IMAGERY IN 'RICHARD II' AND IN 'HENRY IV'¹

It is a commonplace that the development of Shakespeare's style is away from verbal ingenuity and exuberance for their own sake and towards concentrated expression under control for dramatic ends. What I shall have to say here is nothing very new in itself, but it may be said in such a way as to give new significance to an old subject. I shall be concerned only with imagery, and with that only in two plays which come at crucial stages in Shakespeare's poetic and dramatic growth: *Richard II* about 1595, at the end of his 'experimental' years, and *I Henry IV* a year or two later, when he has unmistakably attained his majority. Most of the work on Shakespeare's imagery has had to do with its content and its distribution. But the quality of an image—its fabric and structure and relation to its immediate context—is also interesting and may, as is recognized, be important in revealing something of the poetic process. Much may yet be done in the way of examining Shakespeare's images from this intensive point of view.

On reading the First Part of *Henry IV* immediately after *Richard II* one is struck, along with evidences of greater maturity in other matters, by the difference in the handling of the images. I shall begin with a general statement which will obviously need qualification and if pushed too far will distort the picture, but which, for convenience, has nevertheless to be made at the outset. It may be said that the images in *Richard II* tend to be direct or explicit, complete, correspondent, point by point, to the idea symbolized, and separate one from another; whereas the images in *I Henry IV* tend to be richer in implicit suggestion and in ambiguity, not fully developed, fluid in outline and fused with one another.

These qualities will be evident in the following illustrations:

Richard. I have been studying how I may compare
This prison where I live unto the world:
And for because the world is populous
And here is not a creature but myself,
I cannot do it; yet I'll hammer it out.
My brain I'll prove the female to my soul,
My soul the father; and these two beget
A generation of still-breeding thoughts,

¹ It will be evident in this paper how much I owe to the rather pervasive influence in our time of I. A. Richards and William Empson. But I wish to acknowledge a more specific debt to E. M. W. Tillyard's profoundly stimulating book, *Poetry Direct and Oblique*, London, 1934. Some of the terms I use (*directness, statement, obliquity*) will be recognized as coming from him. Since it is the point of view of the book as a whole that has been important to me, I can give references to particular pages only in a few instances.

And these same thoughts people this little world,
 In humours like the people of this world,
 For no thought is contented. The better sort,
 As thoughts of things divine, are intermix'd
 With scruples and do set the word itself
 Against the word:
 As thus, 'Come, little ones', and then again,
 'It is as hard to come as for a camel
 To thread the postern of a small needle's eye.'
 Thoughts tending to ambition, they do plot
 Unlikely wonders; how these vain weak nails
 May tear a passage through the flinty ribs
 Of this hard world, my ragged prison walls,
 And, for they cannot, die in their own pride.
 Thoughts tending to content flatter themselves
 That they are not the first of fortune's slaves,
 Nor shall not be the last; like silly beggars
 Who sitting in the stocks refuge their shame,
 That many have and others must sit there;
 And in this thought they find a kind of ease,
 Bearing their own misfortunes on the back
 Of such as have before endured the like.
 Thus play I in one person many people,
 And none contented.

(*Richard II*, v, v, 1-32)

Except for the compact and allusive 'do set the word itself Against the word', etc. (ll. 13-17), which at once strikes one because it is so unlike the style of the rest of the play, the passage is explicit throughout. Notice the completeness of the image on the peopling of the world with thoughts, and with the equation of terms—brain to mother, soul to father, thoughts to children with all varieties of temperament who will in turn grow up to breed more of their kind, equally discontented. And then the discontented thoughts are enumerated one by one, each equated with an image more or less fully worked out. In the remainder of the speech, not quoted, it will be recalled how extensively treated is Richard's conceit of himself as a clock. With such a subject, requiring a listing of ideas, the separation of the images is perhaps not as indicative as in some other places. All of Richard's long speeches tend to show this succession of separate images¹ and it may be objected that from the speeches of a character so specially conceived as is Richard we have no right to draw too general conclusions about Shakespeare's style. To this point I shall return later. But it may be noted here that the qualities I have been remarking on in the passage quoted occur generally in the speeches of other characters throughout the play, though Richard's long speeches afford the best examples to illustrate the presence of all of them in any one place.²

¹ See III, ii, 144-56; III, iii, 143-71; the speeches in the deposition scene, IV, 1.

² For other noteworthy examples of fully worked out images see the latter half of Bolingbroke's speech in III, iii (ll. 54-67), where he first compares the meeting of himself and Richard to the meeting of fire and water, and then compares Richard's appearance to

Now consider this passage from *1 Henry IV*:

The skipping King, he ambled up and down
 With shallow jesters and rash bavin wits,
 Soon kindled and soon burnt: carded his state;
 Mingled his royalty with cap'ring fools;
 Had his great name profaned with their scorns
 And gave his countenance, against his name,
 To laugh at gibing boys and stand the push
 Of every beardless vain comparative;
 Grew a companion to the common streets,
 Enfeoff'd himself to popularity;
 That, being daily swallowed by men's eyes,
 They surfeited with honey and began
 To loathe the taste of sweetness, whereof a little
 More than a little is by much too much.
 So, when he had occasion to be seen,
 He was but as the cuckoo is in June,
 Heard, not regarded—seen, but with such eyes
 As, sick and blunted with community,
 Afford no extraordinary gaze,
 Such as is bent on sunlike majesty
 When it shines seldom in admiring eyes;
 But rather drows'd and hung their eyelids down,
 Slept in his face, and rend'red such aspect
 As cloudy men use to their adversaries,
 Being with his presence glutted, gorg'd, and full. (III, ii, 60-84)

Notice the rapid succession of images, the quick suggestion rather than elaboration in such compact and elliptical lines as 'To laugh at gibing boys...' (ll. 66-7) and 'Enfeoff'd himself to popularity' (l. 69), the fusion of one image with another: the skipping and capering with the quick burning of faggots ('rash bavin') and with the adulteration suggested by carding; the enfeoffment with the idea of surfeit (itself boldly linked with eyes), it in turn with the common sight of the cuckoo in June and with the drowsiness of men in constant sunshine, and this latter image shifting ground with 'cloudy men'. In contrast to the way in which the firm outlines of the images in Richard's speech hold the mind within certain limits set by the close equation of idea and image, the rapidity, complexity, and fluidity of the images in Henry's speech help (as well as their substance) to increase their obliquity. Fewer doors are closed.

It is obvious that the interweaving of images such as one finds in the following speech of the Duchess of Gloucester is not the same thing as the fusion in the speech from *Henry IV* just quoted:

that of the sun; also the Queen's and Bushy's talk about her premonition of sorrow (II, ii), where Bushy compares her emotionally distorted visions to the view of a 'perspective', and where the comparison of her premonitions to a child she is about to be delivered of runs throughout the whole episode.

Edward's seven sons, whereof thyself art one,
 Were as seven vials of his sacred blood,
 Or seven fair branches springing from one root:
 Some of those seven are dried by nature's course,
 Some of those branches by the Destinies cut;
 But Thomas, my dear lord, my life, my Gloucester,
 One vial full of Edward's sacred blood,
 One flourishing branch of his most royal root,
 Is crack'd, and all the precious liquor spilt,
 Is hack'd down, and his summer leaves all faded,
 By envy's hand and murder's bloody axe.

(*Richard II*, I, II, 11-21)

The vials and the branches retain their distinctness, and their relation to the idea is rather tediously explored. Again, take a genuinely complex figure from *Richard II*:

for within the hollow crown
 That rounds the mortal temples of a king
 Keeps Death his court, and there the antic sits,
 Scoffing his state and grinning at his pomp,
 Allowing him a breath, a little scene,
 To monarchize, be fear'd and kill with looks,
 Infusing him with self and vain conceit,
 As if this flesh which walls about our life
 Were brass impregnable, and humour'd thus
 Comes at last and with a little pin
 Bores through his castle wall, and farewell king!

(III, II, 160-70)

'Death' hesitates ambiguously in 'Keeps Death his court' between Death as a ruler holding court and Death as a jester holding the real power in the king's court, then shifts certainly to 'Death the antic' (still *within* the hollow crown), and then shifts again to a borer from without. Set this passage against one from *Henry IV*:

Those opposed eyes
 Which, like the meteors of a troubled heaven,
 All of one nature, of one substance bred,
 Did lately meet in the intestine shock
 And furious close of civil butchery,
 Shall now in mutual well-beseeming ranks
 March all one way and be no more oppos'd
 Against acquaintance, kindred, and allies.

(I, I, 9-16)

Here the fusion of images results in a syntactical boldness seldom found in *Richard II*. Moreover, for all the complexity of structure in the passage on Death, the images are fully explicatory; whereas in the passage from *Henry IV* the meanings of 'opposed eyes' and 'meteors of a troubled heaven' are almost wholly implicit.

The differences observed in the passages already quoted are exhibited in certain other ways, namely, in respect to similes, allegorically handled metaphor, and words retaining both a literal and a figurative meaning.

My first impression was that similes were more common in *Richard II* than in *Henry IV*. In a simile, stated as an equation, there is, at least formally, no fusion of idea and image. A closer examination of the two plays does not, in point of fact, bear out my first impression of greater frequency of similes in *Richard II*. But numerical difference is not so important as the character of the similes themselves. and it is true that in *Henry IV* there are fewer fully extended similes of the type here illustrated from *Richard II*:

See, see, King Richard doth himself appear,
As doth the blushing discontented sun
From out the fiery portal of the east,
When he perceives the envious clouds are bent
To dim his glory and to stain the track
Of his bright passage to the occident. (III, iii, 62-7)¹

Two examples of a similar kind in *Henry IV* occur in set speeches, and two occur in a passage where a scene is being vividly described.² But most of the similes in *Henry IV* are brief and colloquial: they are the 'unsavoury similes' applied by Hal and Falstaff to one another; the homely comparisons in the talk of Falstaff and his companions (skin like an old lady's loose gown, withered like an old apple John, roaring like a bullcalf, ragged as Lazarus, vigilant as a cat to steal cream, dank as a dog, stung like a tench); the quick, vivid figures in Hotspur's overflowing speech (fresh as a bridegroom, perfumed like a milliner, tedious as a tired horse or a railing wife, worse than a smoky house). It is characteristic of the style of the play that Hotspur's objection to Kate's swearing (III, i, 252-61), which begins with a simile, 'Heart, you swear like a comfit-maker's wife' (itself by no means a simple statement), leads into an image that embodies a whole nest of subsidiary images, complex and confused:

And givest such sarcenet surety for thy oaths
As if thou ne'er walk'st further than Finsbury.
Swear me, Kate, like a lady as thou art,
A good mouth-filling oath; and leave 'in sooth'
And such protest of pepper gingerbread
To velvet guards and Sunday citizens.

It is surely not insignificant that one finds allegorical use of metaphor only in *Richard II*, not in *Henry IV*. Allegory is sustained metaphor.³

¹ Similar extended similes in *Richard II* occur at II, ii, 16-24; III, ii, 6-11, IV, i, 181-89; V, i, 29-34; V, ii, 23-28.

² (1) Prince Hal's soliloquy (I, ii, 231-40) and Glendower's courtly promise to Mortimer of a song from his daughter (III, i, 216-22), (2) Vernon's comparison of Prince Hal mounting his horse to Mercury or an angel mounting Pegasus, and Hotspur's comparison of the coming of the king's forces to sacrifices to the maid of war, etc (IV, i, 104-10, 113-17).

³ See Tillyard's Chapter IV, 'Some Terms Discussed', especially pp. 57-8, 60-2.

One expects it to have a definite core of statement, of clear correspondence between figure and idea, with however much peripheral suggestion it may be enriched. The little allegory of the garden scene (III, iv), in its exact correspondence of figure and idea, point by point, is explicit and little else. The only places where it achieves obliquity are in the implicit allusion in 'our sea-walled garden' (I. 43) to John of Gaunt's speech, and in the allusion to Eden and the fall of man in the Queen's address to the Gardener as Adam (II. 72-80). In the latter allusion a profounder meaning is suggested than is stated.

In *Henry IV* there are a number of single words which, together with a figurative meaning, retain their literal meaning and greatly enrich the context by this ambiguity. A good example is *balk'd* in Henry's statement that

Ten thousand bold Scots, two-and-twenty knights
Balk'd in their own blood did Sir Walter see
On Holmedon's plains. (I, i, 68-70)

Professor Kittredge (in his notes to the play) defines a *balk* as 'a ridge between two furrows'. Hence, the statement means literally that the bodies are 'piled up in ridges and soaked in blood'; but it also means that the Scots have been thwarted and defeated. The more immediately apprehended figurative meaning is deepened and modified by the force of the literal meaning. Other words in the play which get a similar re-enforcement from two layers of meaning are *malevolent* (I, i, 97), *countenance* (I, ii, 32), *baffle* (I, ii, 114), *frontier* (I, iii, 19), *netiled* (I, iii, 240), *bombast* (II, iv, 359), *teeming* (III, i, 28), *bootless* (III, i, 67), *common-hackney'd* (III, ii, 40), 'stain'd nobility' (v, iv, 13). This use of words is not the same thing as the play on John of Gaunt's name in *Richard II* (II, i, 73-84 and 115), although it springs, of course, from the same alertness to the suggestive power of words. In the passage in *Richard II*, the meanings are all made explicit; in *Henry IV*, they are left implicit, without statement, and often without special emphasis. Moreover, the use in question is not the same thing as an implied pun, for in the former the meanings are overlaid and mutually enriching, in the latter generally disparate and incongruous. In a really good pun, of course, the obvious incongruity may cover a deeper congruity, as in Falstaff's remark to Prince Hal, who finds a bottle of sack in Falstaff's pistol case, 'There's that will sack a city'. But in the use under discussion in the words from *Henry IV*, there is no incongruity.

Words used with this special re-enforcement of meaning are rarer in

Richard II. An example is *down* in Richard's great climactic speech when he surrenders to Bolingbroke:

Down, down I come; like glistering Phaethon,
Wanting the manage of unruly jades.
In the base court? Base court, where kings grow base,
To come at traitors' calls and do them grace.
In the base court? Come down? Down, court! down, king!
For night-owls shriek where mounting larks should sing.

(III. iii. 178-83)

But even here, the secondary meaning of *down* is made explicit, and *base* is played upon as Gaunt's name is played upon.¹

Bearing in mind Coleridge's distinction between *fancy* as 'the aggregative and associative power' and *imagination* as 'the shaping and modifying power' or 'the fusing power', one is tempted to call the images from *Richard II* so far given fanciful, and those from *Henry IV* imaginative. One need not commit oneself to Coleridge's theory of faculty psychology to find the terms useful as descriptive of differences of effect, by whatever mental operation produced. But the matter is too complex to allow of such a simple distinction. A speech such as the Queen's at the sight of Richard coming on his way to the Tower (v. i, 7-15) is an aggregate of separate images, yet at least two of them, 'My fair rose' and 'the model where old Troy did stand' are imaginative in their evocation of meanings not stated. Moreover, Richard *is* the rose; the two terms have coalesced and mutually modify one another, *Richard* contributing all that we have seen throughout the play of his fresh colouring, youth, and charm, the *rose* bringing in a whole aura of associations from experience and literature—colour, freshness, fragrance, beauty, youth, sensuous pleasure, love, evanescence, the *carpe diem* theme. A passage of similar structure is Gaunt's speech on England (II, i, especially ll. 40-59), where, though the rapidly succeeding images (throne, scepter'd isle, seat of Mars, Eden, fortress, little world, precious stone, nurse, teeming womb) are not fused, they are individually more or less rich in suggestion and the whole speech is intense with feeling. However, I do not wish to raise an issue over terms or make the discussion as complex as their just application would entail. I have approached the matter from a somewhat different point of view and have found a different set of terms to be helpful: distinct and fused, explicit and implicit, extended and quickly suggested, and so on. Briefly, the differences in the handling of the images so far exhibited are the differences between enunciation and suggestion.²

¹ See *verge* and *waste*, examples of effective ambiguity, in II, 1, 100-15.

² Tillyard (op. cit., p. 124) uses these two terms in discussing Shirley's 'The glories of our blood and state'.

The examples have been carefully selected, of course, to make the point, and, although they are typical, there are many exceptions. Not all the images in *Richard II* are extended, separate, and enunciatory, and not all in *Henry IV* are brief, fused, and more implicit than explicit. It seems to me significant, however, that there are more exceptions in *Richard II* than in *Henry IV*. This is what one would expect if the difference is a sign, not just of the differences between subject-matter and characters, but of the maturing powers of the writer. The later manner is likely to appear long before it becomes predominant, and *Richard II* is at most only two years earlier than *Henry IV*; but once the later manner has been fully achieved, the earlier manner will almost certainly disappear except when it is consciously adopted for some specific purpose: Gertrude's pretty and formalized description of the death of Ophelia comes to mind. (As a parallel case of stylistic development compare Yeats.) There are, for instance, almost no conceits that can be strictly so called in *Henry IV*; the most striking exception is Hotspur's description of the fight between Mortimer and Glendower on the banks of the frightened Severn (I, iii, 95-107), and the effect of rhetorical exaggeration is intended. The king's response is, 'Thou dost belie him, Percy, thou dost belie him!'

It is interesting that the exceptions to the type in *Richard II* occur almost always in passages describing what the effect of war will be on English soil:

For that our kingdom's earth should not be soil'd
 With that dear blood which it hath fostered;
 And for our eyes do hate the dire aspect
 Of civil wounds plough'd up with neighbours' sword;
 And for we think the eagle-winged pride
 Of sky-aspiring and ambitious thoughts,
 With rival-hating envy, set on you
 To wake our peace, which in our country's cradle
 Draws the sweet infant breath of gentle sleep;
 Which so roused up with boisterous untuned drums,
 With harsh-resounding trumpets' dreadful bray,
 And grating shock of wrathful iron arms,
 Might from our quiet confines fright fair peace
 And make us wade even in our kindred's blood;
 Therefore, we banish you our territories. (I, iii, 125-39)

Here the fusion of images is combined with the same sort of syntactical boldness we have observed in the passage from *Henry IV* on opposed eyes.¹ The oblique allusion contained in the imagery of the opening lines

¹ See p. 116. Other vividly imaginative passages in *Richard II* on this subject (only one, however, with the degree of fusion exhibited in the passage quoted) occur at III, iii, 42-8, 93-100, 161-63, IV, I, 137-44.

of *Henry IV* to these fine passages in *Richard II* re-enforces with powerful effect the sense of continuity established by the explicit allusion to events in the earlier play:

No more the thirsty entrance of this soil
 Shall daub her lips with her own children's blood.
 No more shall trenching war channel her fields,
 Nor bruise her flow'rets with the armed hoofs
 Of hostile paces.

(I. 1, 4-9)

The idea of war on English soil was evidently one which called forth from Shakespeare an intense imaginative response.

I said I should return to the objection that the imagery in *Richard II* is what it is because of the kind of character Richard is and therefore should not be pressed for another significance. It is true enough that its appropriateness is so great that anything better to exhibit his character can hardly be imagined. But I should like to raise the question whether or not Shakespeare would have been tempted by just such a figure at any time very much later in his career. The question is not idle. Although I have not carefully examined the imagery of all the early plays with respect to the qualities here considered, I suspect that it will be found to be generally of the same kind as in *Richard II*; certainly it is in *Romeo and Juliet*. *King John*, though perhaps exceptional in the abundance of imaginative images, is strongly marked, nevertheless, by the elaborate type so frequent in *Richard II*.¹ But in the case of *Richard II*, these characteristics of the imagery are especially striking because they are so beautifully adapted to exhibit the central character. The perfection of the play, within its limits, is the perfection of union between character and a style that Shakespeare had mastered at that stage of his career. He had it at his fingers' ends and he found a character for whom it was dramatically right.

But *1 Henry IV* is a stage beyond *Richard II* in the welding of poetic imagination to dramatic need. This is best illustrated in the case of Hotspur. Dr Tillyard says that there is no profound obliquity in Richard's character and that a good deal of the play is the poetry of statement.² Richard's character is exhibited directly. He is a poet and he speaks poetically. But Hotspur is a hater of poetry who speaks some of the most vivid and the most beautiful poetry in the play. In all of Richard's poetical speeches, he has nothing like Hotspur's speech on honour, so loaded with unexpressed meaning. Yet Hotspur's animad-

¹ See Constance's speeches, especially the one on Death, in III, iv; and Arthur's speech on the irons Hubert is heating, IV, i, 60-70.

² Op. cit., p. 244.

versions on poets and poetry remain convincing. It will not do to say that we do not take him at his word. That is a very superficial view of his character and of Shakespeare's art. We do take him at his word if we pay attention to the play. He is an entire man of action, as he says he is, without artistic habits or interests. He is intensely imaginative, certainly, but imagination is not enough to make a poet. Whereas Richard's speeches are the poems that Shakespeare puts into his mouth as his own compositions, Hotspur's speeches are Shakespeare's poetry to express the mind of a character who could not himself compose a poem at all. This is a very high degree of obliquity in the use of artistic means. It is accomplishment of an altogether different order from the minor perfection of *Richard II*.

It might prove fruitful to examine the imagery of the rest of the plays from the point of view I have suggested in this paper. Miss Spurgeon and Professor G. Wilson Knight have already shown, in different ways, how the 'modifying and shaping power' of the imagination has in the great tragedies produced a kind of running imagery contributory to the tone of each play. One would expect this same power to produce, along with greater boldness in syntax and greater condensation in statement, greater concentration, greater fluidity of outline, and greater suggestiveness in the imagery. The highest achievement of the 'fusing power' of the imagination one feels to be, however, not complexity, but something beyond—utter simplicity of form to express multiplicity of meaning. One thinks of *Antony and Cleopatra*, part of whose great obliquity surely arises from its imagery. *Rich* is not an adequate word to describe it. At its greatest, it is evocative of things that can have no statement:

there is nothing left remarkable
Beneath the visiting moon.

MADELEINE DORAN.

MADISON, WISCONSIN.

THE QUARREL OF THE SATIRISTS

THAT John Weever in 1599 was on Marston's side in the Hall-Marston quarrel seems to be certain.¹ But he did not definitely and by name attack Hall, although there are some sly digs at him in the *Epigrammes*. By 1600, however, his position was different. The evidence for this is in his *Faunus and Mellyflora or, the Original of our English Satyres*, 1600, of which the unique copy is preserved in the Huntington Library. I have not myself seen the book and I rely in what follows on rotographs of the relevant passages.² It is an odd mixture of myth, pastoral, allegory, satire and topicality, and strikes one as being the work of a man who is trying all forms at once in an effort to find his best line. But its main interest for the present purpose is its bearing on the literary history of the period, for it has interesting allusions to Hall and to Marston which have not been noticed until recently; and, if my arguments are sound, it gives us the key to many of the puzzles which are propounded by the series of pamphlets in which the Hall-Marston-Guilpin-Jonson-Weever-Breton quarrels were carried on. This series of interlocked quarrels (in which the *Parnassus Plays* also struck their blows) touches at points, but does not seem to be really involved in the War of the Theatres, and developed into what was almost a free-for-all 'flying'. There has not been any recent account of this chain of abusive writings, and it may be useful to clear up some points by sketching the sequence as a whole.

The quarrel started, it is obscure how,³ between Hall and Marston. Hall published the first three books of his *Virgidemiae* in 1597 and the second three books in 1598. In 1598 also Marston published *The Metamorphosis of Pygmalions Image and Certaine Satyres*, in which occurs 'Reactio', an attack on Hall and *Virgidemiae*. In the 1599 edition of *The Scourge of Villanie* Marston, addressing 'his very friend, Master E.G.', suggests that the quarrel arose because of 'an Epigram which the Author, Virgidemiarum, caused to be pasted to the latter page of every Pigmalion that came to the Stationers of Cambridge'.⁴ But he does not explain how it came about that he attacked Hall in 'Reactio'. The charges in

¹ See an article by the present writer in *R.E.S.* 1935, pp. 66-68.

² I am indebted to my colleague, Miss Jean Robertson, for directing my attention to *Faunus and Mellyflora*. Since writing this article I find that Mr B. H. Newdigate discusses some points connected with Weever's book in *Michael Drayton and his Circle*, pp. 99-100.

³ See *The Satire of John Marston*, Morse S. Allen, Columbus, Ohio, 1920; 'On the Hall-Marston controversy', E. A. Beckwith (*J. of Eng. and Germ. Philol.*, 1926).

⁴ *The Works of John Marston*, ed. J. O. Halliwell, 1856, III, 299.

'Reactio' are simply that Hall's satire of contemporary poetry and manners is unjust, but the tone of the poem is one of personal enmity. It is possible that Marston was jealous of Hall's priority and success as a satirist; that Hall retorted in the rude epigram referred to; and that Marston followed up the quarrel.

The next stage is the issue of Edward Guilpin's¹ *Skialetheia* (entered 15 September 1598) in which *Virgidemiae* is admitted to be 'likened of divers'; but Guilpin adds, with a touch of malice, that

other-some, who would his credite crack
Haue clap'd *Reactioes* Action on his back.²

Weever's *Epigrammes* (1599), already referred to, come next; and at about the same time,³ in the *Parnassus Plays*, somebody at Cambridge was supporting Hall's opinions on academic life and contemporary literature, was quoting an obscene couplet from Guilpin, was referring, not unkindly, to 'one weaver fellow' who makes epigrams, was attacking Marston both by name and under his chosen pseudonym of Kinsayder, and probably in the character of 'Furor Poeticus' as well, and was dismissing Ben Jonson as a mere bricklayer.

Most of this is already known, but now we come to *Faunus and Melliflora*. The framework is an account of how satires originated. It appears that Melliflora, a wood-nymph, marries Faunus, arousing thereby the anger of Diana who exacts punishment by transforming Melliflora's unborn son into a satyr whose descendants come over from Italy to England with Brutus. Diana further obtains from Jove that satyrs (i.e. satires)

Should euermore be vtter enemies,
To louers pastimes, sportful veneries.
Ioue granted her this lawful rust demand,
As we may see within our Faerie land:
The Satyres ierking sharp fang'd poesie,
Lashing and biting *Venus* luxurie,
Gauling the sides of foule impiety,
Scourging the lewdnesse of damnd villany,
Shooting out sharp quills in each angry line,
Through heapt-vp vices like the porcupine.
If this praise-worthy be, then first of all
Place I the Satire Academicall,
His Satyres worthy are (if any one)
To be ingrau'd in brasse, and marble stone:
Detracting nothing from the excellencie,
Of the *Rhamnusian* Scourge of Villanie,
But I was borne to hate your censuring vaine,
Your enuious biting in your crabbed straine.⁴

¹ Doubtless Marston's 'very friend, Master E.G.'

² *Skialetheia*, Shaks. Ass Facs. No. 2, ed. G. B. Harrison, sig. E v.

³ The dates are a little uncertain. See Chambers, *Eliz. Stage*, s.v.

⁴ *Faunus and Melliflora*, sig. F3. Cf. *Virgidemiae*, title page to the first three books; v, iii, 1-2; Marston, *Scourge of Villanie*, ed. cit., 247, ll. 1-2.

Weever's position is clear: the references to Hall and Marston are obvious, and one notices that he places Hall first and is at pains to quote with approval a line of Hall's to which Marston had taken exception.¹

Having said that he hates satires, Weever proceeds to show what he can do in that 'censuring vaine' by translating the first satire of Horace, and he continues with satire until, when he has advanced a few lines into the first satire of Juvenal,

Venus (to whome it is daungerous denying any reasonable request) hearing glouming Iuuenall threaten so grent a punishment, entreates my Muse, that for a while she would leaue him in his English tongue vnperfect yet to Venus she makes a vow, that Iuuenal, Horace, and Persius shall hereafter all be translated.²

The allegory of the 'Satyres' then proceeds. Venus, angry at being assailed, and having, in revenge, ruined the Italians by inspiring them all with lechery, comes to England, where,

Hearing before the Satyres enmitie,
Gaunst her proceedings and her detie,
Vsing all mischief gaunst her enemies,
Thrusting her selfe in bandy elegies,
Polluting with her damned luxury,
All eares which vowd were vnto chastity,
And euermore thus on fel mischief bent,
Vntil she found (she neuer was content :)
Some of her Saints (belike) who euery day,
Vnto her shrine their orizons did say:
Which fore she askt, this boone to her was giuing,
That all the Satyres then in England liuing
Should sacrificde be in the burning fire,
To pacifie so great a goddesse ire,
And from their Cyndars should a Satyre rise,
Which their Satyricke snarling should despise.³

This is a clear reference to the burning of satirical books in June 1599. What exactly is meant by the satire who rises from the ashes I am not certain. Weever may be thinking of his own unwritten translations of the Latin satirists. But it is perhaps relevant that Hall's satires were reprieved from the burning and were reprinted in 1599 and 1602.⁴

Weever then goes on to 'A Prophetie of this present yeare, 1600', in which, taking a hint from *Virgidemiae*,⁵ he pretends that there is no need

¹ Hall had written:

And somewhat say, as more vnworthie done,
Worthie of Brasse, and hoary Marble stone.

(*His Defiance to Enuie*, 59-60)

Marston had mocked:

Come, somewhat say (but hang me when tis done)

Worthy of brasse and hoary marble stone; ('*Reactio*', ed. cit., 231)

² Last page of gathering H.

³ Sig. I2.

⁴ See Arber's *Transcript*, III, 678.

⁵ *Virgidemiae*, VI, 1.

for satire since all vice has disappeared from England. The significance of this poem is that it attacks Marston. It begins:

Then cease fond Satyres quipping Epigrammatists,
 She scoffing Critickes, iearing Lucianists,
 Sterne censuring *Catoes*, ful gorg'd *Lucilians*,
 Enue-swolne *Cynickes* al-eyde *Epidaurians*,
 Vnringed routing hogges otter toothd *Rhamnusians*,
 Cease cease to bawle, thou wasp-stung Satyrlist,
 Let none so testy petulant insist:
 Hold, stay thy lashing hand, and ierking rimes. . .¹

It was Marston who declared that he bore 'the scourge of just *Rhamnusia*',² it was Marston who told the 'guzzell dogs' to 'Skud the lashes of his yerking rime'.³ Weever says⁴ that *Gallus* and *Sylene* have amended the evil ways which Marston satirized them for,⁵ and that *Lucia*⁴ no longer uses, as Marston averred,⁶ either 'ioulting coaches' or obscene instruments; and he ends by a direct reference to *The Scourge of Villanie* when he writes:

*Giue me a Kingdome Cynicke, now I can
 Shew thee a complete rightly perfect man.*⁴

Marston's eighth satire is what he calls 'A Cynicke Satyre', and it begins

A man, a man, a Kingdome for a man'
 Why, how now, currish, mad Athenian?
 Thou Cynick dog, see'st not the streets do swarme
 With troups of men? No, no: for Cyrcees charme
 Hath turn'd them all to swine.⁷

Weever goes on to point out the danger that a satirist, attacking vice, may merely write pornography; and he illustrates⁸ the risk of contaminating the innocent in a passage which is clearly suggested by the first portrait Marston draws in his 'Cynick Satyre';⁹ and one notes that the word 'court-boy' is taken over in its particular sense from Marston.¹⁰ A phrase of Marston's reappears in Weever's

Gallus hath left his new-stampt blasphemies;

but there are many such similarities and verbal echoes which show that Weever had Marston very much in mind; and it is therefore important to observe that he has so far moved away from the admiration he felt in 1599 for Marston as to conclude his 'prophesie' with the lines:

What beastlnesse by others you haue showne,
 Such by yourselues tis thought that you haue knowne.¹¹

¹ Sig. I 2 v.

³ Ibid.

⁵ Ed. cit., III, 262. It is interesting to note that the name Faunus appears in this passage.

⁶ Ibid., 259.

⁸ Sig. I 3 v.

¹⁰ Ibid., 243.

² Ed. cit., III, 247

⁴ Sig. I 3.

⁷ Ibid., 278.

⁹ Ed. cit., III, 278.

¹¹ Sig. I 4 v.

In 1600, then, Weever had moved to the Hall side of the quarrel, and seems to have felt rather strongly about Marston, though he was not yet prepared to come completely into the open as an enemy.

The quarrel next produced *The Whipping of the Satyre*, 1601, which is ascribed to 'W.I.' who signs the *Ad Lectorem*. 'W.I.' has been identified as one William Ingram,¹ but Weever has also been named.² Although the evidence is not as strong as I should like. I believe that Weever was the author.

The Whipping attacks a satirist, an epigrammatist and a 'humorist'. These, I submit, are Marston, Guilpin, and Jonson respectively. In the complimentary poem signed by 'I.F.' the reader is told to look at the author of *The Whipping* and

.. view him well, that with impartiall eye,
Dares scourge the Scourger of base villany.

The reference to *The Scourge of Villanie* is plain. 'W.I.' then takes up the tale, describing the satirist in words that precisely fit Marston's style, and avows:

Faith, this will make the Chronicle to shine,
That in the yeere (it skils not for the day)
1 5 9 & 9
A Satyre on the Duell made a fray:
And with a penne because you made the same,
Satyr-Pen-Dragon we will call your name.³

The date 1599 is the date of the complete *Scourge of Villanie* which the writer was probably using. Lastly, to confirm the identification, we find:

But harke, I heare the *Cynicke Satyre* crie,
A man. a man, a kingdome for a man.
Why, was there not a man to serue his eye?
No, all were turn'd to beasts that headlong ran.
Who cried a man, a man then was he none,
No, but a beast by his confession.⁴

This is a clear reference to the lines of Marston already quoted.

The epigrammatist is next attacked, and 'W.I.' says of him:

You kept such reuell with your carelesse pen,
As made me thinke you of the Innes of Court:
For they vse Reuels more then any men....⁵

and again:

You say, our Land is giuen to gluttony,
Epicurizing with such sumptuous fare,
As breeds a surfet of Intemperancy:
But in this case you much deceyued are.
For each rich glutton that too much doth eate,
There's ten poore beggers starue for want of meat.

¹ See Morse S. Allen, op. cit., p. 15.

³ Sig. C3.

² C.H.E.L. IV, Bibliography, following Collier.

⁴ Sig. D2.

⁵ Sig. E4 v.

So, if you speake it vnuersally
 Of this our Land, your speach is most vntrew:
 For go ye to the Vnuersitie,
 And you shall there no sumptuous Commons view.
 What? said I, None? Yes, yes, the truth to touch,
 Their fare is sumptuous, for it costs them much.¹

The hint here given that the epigrammatist was at the Inns of Court, and the intrusion, with what looks like a personal application, of the poverty of university students, suggest Guilpin as a possibility. He entered Emmanuel College, Cambridge, on 1 June 1588,² and was therefore a contemporary of Hall, who entered the same college in 1589.³ He apparently abandoned the university without taking a degree, and was admitted to Gray's Inn on 29 April 1591.⁴ He satirizes an 'Epicurean' life in *Skialetheia*, epigram 25. That he was the epigrammatist is pretty well confirmed by a passage in the prose introduction to *The Whipping*:

The whole Epigram doth nothing but make way for the last two lines, which are brought in like a piece of cheese and a manchet, to digest all that went before. And verily you haue greatly troubled your selfe in naming certaine particular persons. Such a one you call Fabius, and another, Felix, anon comes me Rufus and Clodius, and such a company of Imaginarie persons and inuisible Ideas, to hold your worship talke, as would fat a man with laughter, or fill him with wonder. In the end, when your page hath playd the knaue with euery one a little, you turne ouer a new leafe, and cal for more company with whom, lest any should suspect you to be no great scholler, you talke of the intellectuall Quintessence, Genius, and such great secrets of Art wonderfull luxuriously. How your tongue rioted in bawdery, I am ashamed to rehearse....⁵

Guilpin's epigrams in *Skialetheia* are often of six lines ending with a couplet; they deserve the charge of 'bawdery'; the names *Fabius*, *Felix* and *Clodius* occur together within thirty lines in the first satire of *Skialetheia*, and *Clodius* is the victim of three of the epigrams;⁶ and at the end of the book Guilpin does turn over a new leaf in that the fifth satire ends with 'haue done my merry rime', and the sixth and last satire deals with the degeneration of men's thoughts, criticizes contemporary poets, and has a good deal of polysyllabic stuff to say about Reason and Genius. Additional proof that Guilpin is the epigrammatist comes from *No Whipping* (for which see below) where we read:

The Epigrammist in his quips displaies
 A wicked course in shadowes of corrections.⁷

The allusion is quite clearly to the meaning of the title *Skialetheia*.

That the 'humorist' is Ben Jonson seems indisputable, since he talks 'of mens humours and dispositions' and has 'made sale of his Humours

¹ Sig. E 5 v.

² *Skialetheia*, ed. cit., p. vi.

³ It is perhaps possible that it was from Guilpin that Marston got the garbled information about Hall's life which seems to lie behind the satire on Hall in Marston.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. vii.

⁵ Sig. A 4.

⁶ Nos. 17, 22, 43. I do not find *Rufus*.

⁷ Sig. A 4.

to the theater, and there plaid Pee boh with the people in his humour and then out of his humour'.¹

The evidence that Weever is the author of *The Whipping* is somewhat scanty, but (1) the transposition of initials is not extraordinary; (2) the evidence of *Faunus and Melliflora* disposes of the objection that, according to the *Epigrammes*, he was a friend of Marston's, and shows, on the contrary, that in 1600 he was hostile; (3) *The Whipping* and *Faunus and Melliflora* both make the same points: that Marston writes pornography, is suspected of practising the vices he attacks, corrupts the innocent by his satires, is a violent and foul-mouthed writer; and both seize on the 'Cynicke Satyre' in exactly the same way. It is noteworthy, too, that the device of making a date fill out a line of verse occurs not only in *The Whipping* but also in Weever's *Epigrammes*,² and I have not met with it anywhere else; (4) the 'I.F.' who introduces 'W.I.' in *The Whipping* introduces Weever in *Faunus and Melliflora*; (5) Weever was of Queens' College, Cambridge, and was therefore in a position to be one of the Cambridge group involved in these quarrels; (6) in the reply to *The Whipping*³ 'W.I.' is called a stripling, and an 'impecunious asse'; there is mention of 'a Iudas kisse'; it is stated that he does 'after some promotion gape'. and is a Cambridge man: Weever was born in 1576, he does not seem to have been well-to-do, he was certainly feeling his way in the world at this period, and he seems to have changed his side in this quarrel; (7) the author of this reply declares that he himself is 'Vnknowne thy foe, though knowen perhaps thy frend', which *may* refer to the probable fact that Weever in 1599 had some acquaintance with the Marston circle. This evidence does not take us far, but it justifies our believing it possible that Weever was 'W.I.'

The Whipping provoked *The Whipper of the Satyre his pennance in a white sheete; Or, The Beadles Confutation*, 1601, by 'an unknown supporter of Marston'.⁴ I would suggest, very tentatively, that this unknown supporter was Guilpin. The friendship between Marston and Guilpin has been sufficiently demonstrated; the unknown supporter is himself a satirist and has been attacked;⁵ and in the following mock-modest

¹ Sig. A4. This attack on Jonson links the Hall-Marston quarrel with the stage-quarrel; and one might compare the attack on Jonson in the *Parnassus Plays*.

² II, 21.

³ *The Whipper* (see below), sigs. A3 v-B.

⁴ Morse S. Allen, op. cit., p. 19.

⁵

... imagine then
You see the *Satyrs* Whipper in his pride,
Drawne by an Infant of a *Satyr*ist:
Who though he hath received many a ierke,
Read with what patience he susteynes the yoke.
(*The Whipper*, 'To All Iudiciall Censurers')

passage the reference to 'Arts maister' and the emphasis on 'Epigrammatist' may be significant:

Were I a *Satyre*, as no *Satirist*,
A *Poet*, as I cannot poetize:
Or as thou tearm'd an Epigrammatist:
Were I *Arts* maister, or could moralize...¹

It looks as though the writer were the 'Epigrammatist' of *The Whipping*, who has been shown to be Guilpin. That he should have cobbled up some reply to the attack on himself and Marston was to be expected, and there is nothing in *The Whipper* which prohibits our ascribing it to him.

The Whipper harks back for a few lines to the almost forgotten origin of the quarrel:

What shall I stand in dread of conuration,
Because *Vntrusse* hath from his duskie Caue
Sent a leane writhen Beadle all in haste,
To lay the manton of the *Satyres* waste.²

I take 'Vntrusse' to be Hall with reference to the title of *Virgidemiae*,³ and the allusion to be to the fact that Hall, personally, had dropped out of the quarrel early, and left it to be carried on by his supporters. The 'duskie Caue' is, I suppose, a reference to the obscurity of *Virgidemiae*, which was one of the usual topics in this quarrel.

The last document of the series need not delay us. It is *No Whippinge nor trippinge: but a kinde friendly Snippinge*, 1601, of which 'Nicholas Breton was the undoubted author'.⁴ Breton had been drawn in by an attack on *Pasquils Mad-cap* in *The Whipping*⁵ to which he refers⁶ in his attempt to smooth over the quarrel. The attempt was successful, to all appearances, and the quarrel seems to have died.

Faunus and Melliflora has helped in the study of this quarrel, but it also raises other possibilities which I cannot myself at present investigate.⁷ I mention the fact in the hope that other students of this side of Elizabethan literature will clear them up.

A. DAVENPORT.

WIGAN.

¹ *The Whipper*, sig. A 3 v.

² *Ibid.*, sig. B 4.

³ Unless, indeed, there had come to Guilpin's ears some rumour of the offer to Hall in 1601 of the mastership of Peter Blundell's school—an offer which he turned down in favour of the living of Hawstead, which he entered on 2 Dec. 1601.

⁴ Morse S. Allen, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

⁵ *The Whipping*, sig. F 3 v.

⁶ *No Whippinge*, sig. A 4.

⁷ Who, for instance, is 'I.F.'? Did Jonson do anything about Weever's(?) attack on him? What caused Weever to change his mind about Marston? Was it anything to do with 'I.F.'? These questions are, however, possibly already answered, or unanswerable.

THE THIRD EARL OF SHAFTESBURY AS A LITERARY CRITIC

SHAFTESBURY, the author of the *Characteristics*, has received but little recognition from the literary historian. While his philosophy has commanded a certain amount of attention, as a man of letters he is known chiefly for his rather ornate style and for an irritating pomposity that led De Quincey to call him 'the most absolute and undistinguishing pedant that perhaps literature has to show'.¹ Yet Shaftesbury has a great deal to say about literature, and his writings were very popular in the eighteenth century with poets as well as philosophers.² His importance to literary criticism, if not overlooked altogether, has generally been misunderstood. It consists not in isolated references to and judgements of particular works, although these abound in his writings, but rather in the formulation of general principles derived from his philosophy as a whole. In the volume of essays (some of which are only partly completed and are in the form of notes) entitled *Second Characters*, Shaftesbury endeavoured to apply his philosophy to the subject of literature, but an early death cut short this work. His thought, however, apart from this attempt at an aesthetic, had a considerable influence, as we shall see, on subsequent literary criticism, by developing certain main ideas which formed the assumptions of critical theory throughout a great deal of the eighteenth century.

In many ways, Shaftesbury's criticism is merely representative of the age in which he lived. In his veneration for the Ancients and in his views on the relation between art and morality, he reproduced opinions that can be found in the work of any of his contemporaries. Yet even here there is a wealth of sound sense and often a deep insight into the nature of literary questions. But beyond all this there are to be found the germs of many new doctrines that belong to the eighteenth rather than the seventeenth century. Certainly he himself thought he was making a novel contribution to criticism. He conceived his task to be the awakening of his contemporaries' sensibility to the beauties of the arts, in a word, to the formation of good taste.

This disposition of our countrymen [i.e. their insularity], from whatever causes it may possibly be derived, is, I fear, a very prepossessing circumstance against our author, whose design is to advance something new, or at least something different from what is commonly current in philosophy and morals. To support this design of his he seems

¹ Collected writings of De Quincey, ed. Masson, 1870, vol. iv, pp. 25-6.

² The *Characteristics*, published in 1711, went into eleven editions in English by 1790.

132 *The Third Earl of Shaftesbury as a Literary Critic*

intent chiefly on this single point, 'to discover how we may to best advantage form within ourselves what in the polite world is called a relish or good taste.'¹

Shaftesbury's interest in literature is part of his general philosophical endeavour. On the one hand, he had to counter a mechanistic philosophy which had been strengthened by the writings of Hobbes and Locke and which was unsympathetic to the imaginative and creative effort of literature. On the other, he had to meet the Puritanical distrust of beauty and the arts, which although dying away in practice had never been given its final answer. His writings are a reassertion of man's feeling for the beauty of the world, and an attempt to escape, on the one side from the asceticism of the Christian Faith, as represented in an extreme form by Puritanism, and the art-destroying, stultifying influence of mechanism, on the other.

Although Shaftesbury has many points in common with contemporary critics, it is his anticipations of the future rather than his echoes of the past that strike us most forcibly. He holds that art is imitative and yet he believes it to be an act of creation. He adopts the 'judgement-fancy' distinction by which Hobbes explains the process of poetic invention, and yet he upholds the Platonic doctrine of reminiscence. He is a staunch advocate of reason and at times seems to suggest that it is the faculty which makes aesthetic judgements, and yet he is the English critic most responsible for the introduction into criticism of 'taste' and the use of the term *je ne sais quoi*. His main influence is a liberalizing one. Although he never sets out to undermine the structure of contemporary criticism, he undoubtedly hastens the changes that come about in eighteenth-century aesthetics and literary theory. The long passages in the *Moralists* which apostrophize the beauties of nature sound a note that is heard with increasing frequency after his day. His optimistic philosophy which teaches that God is manifested in the ugly and terrible things of nature, and that these are really essential elements in a beautiful whole, formed part of that increasing attention paid by eighteenth-century literature to the awful and frightening aspects of the natural world. In the *Characteristics* we can observe the conception of beauty as 'unity in variety' changing to that of beauty as greatness (as in Addison) or beauty as terror (as in Burke). Shaftesbury upholds the unity in variety conception, but his variety undoubtedly consists of the great, the terrible and even the ugly. He must be given some credit, too, however small, for the development of the concept of the sublime in eighteenth-century

¹ *Miscellany*, III, *Characteristics*, II, 251-2. The edition referred to throughout is that of J. M. Robertson, London, 1900.

aesthetics. We must now turn to more detailed consideration and corroboration of the above general statements.

IMITATION AND POETIC INVENTION

Shaftesbury, like most of his contemporaries, followed Aristotle in making imitation the nature of poetry. The tendency of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was to overemphasize the idealization of reality which art makes and to think of poetic imitation as a representation of the external world of men and things purged of all peculiarities and devoid of particulars. This was a tendency only, and we must not press this point too far. But the rightful insistence which critics of this time placed on paying attention to essentials rather than incidentals, is one that easily lends itself to such a view.¹ Perhaps the most famous expression of this view is to be found in Sir Joshua Reynolds's *Discourses*.²

Not all critics thus interpreted Aristotle, however, and Dryden, for one, has a profounder account of imitation. In *A Parallel of Poetry and Painting* he says,

Now, as this idea of perfection is of little use in portraits, or the resemblances of particular persons, so neither is it in the characters of Comedy and Tragedy, which are never to be made perfect, but always to be drawn with some specks of frailty and deficiency; such as they have been described to us in history, if they were real characters, or such as the poet began to shew them at their first appearance, if they were only fictitious or imaginary.³

With Dryden, Shaftesbury sees that the universal in art can be embodied in a particular and need not imply generalization.

Nor is it enough that the persons introduced speak pertinent and good sense at every turn. . . . For the understanding here must have its mark, its characteristic note, by which it may be distinguished. It must be such and such an understanding; as when we say, for instance, such or such a face; since Nature has characterized tempers and minds as peculiarly as faces. And for an artist who draws naturally, 'tis not

¹ Cf. Dennis, *Remarks on Prince Arthur*, London, 1696, pp. 47-8: '... a Poet is not so much to consult Nature in any particular Person, which is but a Copy, and an imperfect copy of Universal Nature; he is to examine that Universal Nature, which is always perfect, and to consult the Original Ideas of things, which in a Sovereign manner are beautiful. . . . Thus if a Poet is to draw a King or a great Captain. . . if History has given that King or that Captain, any shameful Frailty, or low Vice, which are unworthy of the Majesty of the one, and of the high Command of the other, the Poet is obliged to conceal that Frailty and to dissemble that Vice.' Vide also Le Bossu, *Traité du Poème Epique*, Paris, 1675, pp. 83-4: 'Il [i.e. Aristote] n'ordonne pas de chercher d'abord dans l'Histoire quelque grande Action, et quelque Personne Héroïque; mais il ordonne au-contraire, de faire une Action générale, qui ne soit d'aucun particulier; d'imposer les Noms aux Personnes après cette première Fiction, et de former en-suite les Episodes.'

² See, in particular, *Discourse III*, delivered in 1770.

³ *Essays of Dryden*, ed. W. P. Ker, Oxford, 1900, II, 125. Ker himself in his Introduction seems to misunderstand or underestimate this difference between Dryden's point of view and Reynolds's.

enough to show us merely faces which may be called men's: every face must be a certain man's.¹

But he sees poetic invention not only as imitation, but as an act of creation. 'They are mean spirits', he tells us, 'who love to copy merely, nothing is agreeable or natural but what is original.'² Shaftesbury follows Plotinus in placing beauty in the forming power of the mind,³ but when he comes to discuss art he abandons Plotinus and adopts the Aristotelian doctrine of *mimesis*. It is easy enough to understand this, for the influence of Aristotle upon theories of art and poetry at this time is difficult to overestimate. Actually there is no reason why Shaftesbury should not have followed Plotinus's treatment of art, and a conception of art as an imitation of the world of Ideas would have been more consistent with his general philosophy. As it is there is no really clear account of what he considers to be the nature of art.

But above all in his analysis of the working of the human mind in poetic composition he breaks away from his contemporaries. Throughout the seventeenth century the beginnings of modern psychology can be seen in the tentative enquiries made into the workings of the human mind. At bottom, however, the analysis had always been in terms of associationism. The mind was conceived as a *tabula rasa* upon which the outside world made impressions. The mind was passive and these impressions from the outside world resolved themselves into chains of ideas, the sequence of which was determined by the laws of association and not by any power of the mind itself. The implications of this for literary invention were never summed up so clearly as in the famous passage of Hobbes's *Answer to Davenant*.

Time and Education begets experience; Experience begets memory; Memory begets Judgement and Fancy: Judgement begets the strength and structure and Fancy begets the ornaments of a Poem.⁴

This antithesis between judgement and fancy (or imagination, for there is no distinction between them for the seventeenth century), in which the latter takes a subordinate part in poetic composition, is echoed by many other writers of the time. Dryden elaborates the analysis and adds 'elocution' to judgement and fancy, and in a similar passage goes on to say:

¹ *Advice to an Author, Characteristics*, I, 132.

² *Miscellany*, V, *Characteristics*, II, 319 in the notes.

³ *Moralists, Characteristics*, II, 132-3, where he advances the neo-Platonic view that the forms of beauty are the image of the Universal Soul: 'The beautiful, the fair, the comely, were never in the matter, but in the art and design; never in body itself, but in the form or forming power. Does not the beautiful form confess this, and speak the beauty of the design when-ever it strikes you?'

⁴ *English Critical Essays of the 17th Century*, ed. Spingarn, Oxford, 1908, II, 59.

The composition of all poems is, or ought to be, of wit; and wit in the poet, . . . is no other than the faculty of imagination in the writer, which, like a nimble spaniel, beats over and ranges through the field of memory, till it springs the quarry it hunted after; or, without metaphor, which searches over all the memory for the species or ideas of those things which it designs to represent.¹

This image obviously influences Dennis's account of artistic invention,² and Rymer, too, subordinates imagination to judgement.³

Shaftesbury adopts the Hobbesian antithesis between fancy and judgement,⁴ but he repudiates the whole associationist conception of the human mind and vigorously asserts the existence of innate ideas. His belief is even more significant when we call to mind that Locke who had been his tutor, had written a long polemic against innate ideas in his *Essay*. There is no need here to attempt to disentangle the ambiguity of the term 'innate ideas' or to decide whether anyone ever held a belief in the possibility of such ideas in the sense that Locke attacked them. The point for us is that Shaftesbury denied that the human mind is a *tubula rasa* and that knowledge can only be built up from experience. There is a long passage in the *Moralists* devoted to a discussion of innate ideas, and Shaftesbury (in the person of Theocles) introduces it thus.

. . . the mind conceiving of itself, can only be, as you say, assisted in the birth. Its pregnancy is from its nature. Nor could it ever have been thus impregnated by any other mind than that which formed it at the beginning; and which, as we have already proved, is original to all mental as well as other beauty.⁵

There is no explicit statement of a theory of creative imagination in Shaftesbury's works. But his belief in innate ideas; in the mind's helping to constitute its own knowledge; coupled with the conception of God as an artist,⁶ and the poet as a creator; all provide hints for the possible development of such a theory. The following description of the true poet is a profound one and embraces a view of poetic composition which provided the basis of aesthetic theory in the late eighteenth century:

But for the man who truly and in a just sense deserves the name of poet, and who as a real master, or architect in the kind, can describe both men and manners, and give to an action its just body and proportions, he will be found, if I mistake not, a

¹ *Preface to Annus Mirabilis, Essays*, ed. Ker, I, 14. 'Wit' here, of course, means fancy or imagination, and as such is contrasted with judgement. It has thus come to mean exactly the opposite of what it meant to the Elizabethans.

² *Remarks on the Dunciad*, 1729, p. 22. 'For memory may justly be compared to the Dog that beats the Field, or the Wood, and that startles up the Game; Imagination is the Falcon that clips it upon its Pimons after it, and Judgment that is the Falconer who directs the flight and governs the whole.'

³ *Tragedies of the Last Age*, 1678: *English Critical Essays of the 17th Century*, II, 185: 'But Fancy, I think, in Poetry, is like Faith in Religion: it makes far discoveries, and soars above reason, but never clashes or runs against it. Fancy leaps and frisks and away she's gone, whilst reason rattles the chains and follows after. Reason must consent and ratify what-ever by fancy is attempted in its absence, or else 'tis all null and void in law.'

⁴ *Characteristics*, I, 181.

⁵ *Characteristics*, II, 135.

⁶ Vide *Moralists*, *passim*.

very different creature. Such a poet is indeed a second *Maker*; a just Prometheus under Jove. Like that sovereign artist or universal plastic nature, he forms a whole, coherent and proportioned in itself, with due subjection and subordination of constituent parts.¹

REASON AND TASTE

To call the age in which Shaftesbury lived a rationalistic one is an oversimplification. There was perhaps a tendency at the end of the seventeenth century to make reason the criterion of everything; in religion, morals and metaphysics, as well as literature. But to talk in this way is a misuse of the word 'reason'. The tendency is described more accurately by the word 'reasonable' than by 'reason' and is summed up best perhaps by the rather vague term 'good-sense'. In literary criticism it shows itself in the desire to make a work of art acceptable to men's experience, rather than in any identification of poetic invention with the faculty of intellection. No poet or critic could have thought of poetic invention in terms of reason alone. The generally accepted view was that elaborated by Hobbes and described above, which rested poetic invention on the distinction between judgement and fancy.

The growth of 'reason' and 'good-sense' as part of the presuppositions of seventeenth-century literary criticism has been described in a detailed way by various writers and by some has been overestimated. The most convincing account that has been given attributes it mainly to the advance of scientific method. Science taught the seventeenth century to look at the rational world as a body of coherent and orderly laws. If poetry is an imitation of nature, then it, too, must be governed by and express these laws. Dennis puts the matter as succinctly as anyone.

But, as both Nature and Reason, which two, in a larger Acceptation, is Nature, owe their Greatness, their Beauty, their Majesty, to their perpetual Order, . . . so Poetry which is an Imitation of nature must do the same Thing. It can neither have Greatness or Real Beauty, if it swerves from the Laws which Reason severely prescribes it, and the more Irregular any Poetical composition is, the nearer it comes to Extravagance and Confusion, and to Nonsense, which is nothing.²

Shaftesbury reflected this growth of reason and good sense, but modified it by introducing considerations of taste. At first sight there would appear to be plenty of evidence to suggest that he makes reason the ultimate criterion. His exhortations to follow nature are uttered frequently and with conviction, and the appeal to reason certainly holds a higher place in his theory than the Ancients and the rules. But although there is this rational element in his critical writings, it is not so strongly

¹ *Characteristics*, I, 135-6.

² Dennis, *Advancement and Reformation of Modern Poetry*, 1701; in *Critical Works of John Dennis*, ed. E. N. Hooker, Baltimore, 1939, I, 202.

emphasized as in the work of the majority of his contemporaries. and it is rather in the concept of taste that he finds his guiding principle. Shaftesbury in this follows such writers of his day as Dennis, Temple, Gildon and Farquhar, who all emphasize taste. These writers did not form a School of Taste, but their combined influence marks a development of part of the tradition of seventeenth-century criticism. The disregard of mere formal correctness; the insistence upon a charm in art beyond the rules, and to be judged only by its effectiveness; the conception of literature as the product of changing historical factors, and of the critic as a virtuoso, or, in some cases, possessing the artistic sensibility of the poet or playwright himself; the practice of considering the beauties rather than the faults of a particular poem and of speaking in particular terms rather than generalizations; all these, although they might not have formed parts of a self-conscious movement, indicate that the tide of criticism at the end of the seventeenth century was setting in a different direction.

Those elements in a work of art which defy analysis and can only be described in terms of the effect they produce, possess a quality, declares Shaftesbury, which for want of any other name he calls the *je ne sais quoi*. He deprecates the attitude that would make this a mysterious or esoteric thing and declares that the quality is a charm which is captured from nature. But in spite of this he nowhere makes clear what he himself means by the term, and indeed its very use points to the inadequacy of all attempts to give such explanations.

Though his [i.e. the poet's] intention be to please the world, he must nevertheless be, in a manner, above it, and fix his eye upon that consummate grace, that beauty of Nature, and that perfection of numbers which the rest of mankind, feeling only by the effect whilst ignorant of the cause, term the *je ne say quoy*, the unintelligible or the I know not what, and suppose to be a kind of charm or enchantment of which the artist himself can give no account.¹

The origin and growth of the use of the term *je ne sais quoi* is not easy to trace. Bouhours discusses the matter in his *Les Entretiens d'Ariste et d'Eugène* where he says,

Les Italiens, qui font mystère de tout, emploient en toutes rencontres leur *non so che*: on ne voit rien de plus commun dans leurs poètes.²

He himself devotes more space to it than any of his contemporaries, and it is likely that Shaftesbury is indebted to him for the use of the word. There is no evidence to suggest that it was much in vogue in England

¹ *Advice to An Author, Characteristics*, I, 214. Cf. *Pope's Essay on Criticism*, ll. 154-6:

'And snatch a grace beyond the reach of art,
Which, without passing thro' the judgment, gains
The heart, and all its end at once attains.'

² *Les Entretiens d'Ariste et d'Eugène*, Amsterdam, 1671, 5th Conversation.

before Shaftesbury's day and it is to the influence of the *Characteristics* that we must trace what popularity it gained in this country.

But although there is an irrational element in the appreciation of works of art, there is for Shaftesbury a universal and absolute standard of taste. Each person is not a rule to himself and Shaftesbury never uses the word 'taste' in the sense of mere personal liking or disliking, as some of his predecessors had done. Yet there can be no doubt that the concept of taste by stressing the emotional rather than the rational element in the aesthetic judgement did much to lessen the objectivity of the standard in men's eyes, although Shaftesbury, himself, would have deplored this result.¹

This standard of taste is founded on nature and is the one set up by men of culture and sensibility through the ages. It is not imposed on people, for it is merely the considered verdict of those who are best qualified to judge in matters of art. It is a natural standard by which men may educate themselves. Nor is it merely fashion. For a man may differ from the accepted opinion of his own day and still be right in his judgement. But this, though possible, is unlikely, for there will usually be a number of people who have made it their business to discover what is the true standard.²

It is often suggested that the growth of the concept of taste in English criticism at this time was due to the influence of French writers. But Shaftesbury does not seem to be greatly indebted to the French critics. He has occasional references, as have most other critics of the time, to Boileau, Le Bossu, and Corneille. But his debt to these and their fellows, if it exists, extends only to two topics, the condemnation of the Christian epic and the attack on the Italian Opera, and these were part of the general critical currency of the period. To the French School of Taste it is probable that Shaftesbury owes more. He is one of the few writers of the time who refer to La Bruyère³ and he also cites St Évremond.⁴ But it is to Bouhours that he would seem to have most affinity though he never mentions him by name.

The idea being given increasing and repeated emphasis by later seventeenth-century critics, that literature is influenced by national, political, social and climatic forces, is very much in evidence in the *Characteristics*. There are many places in which Shaftesbury resolves differences between national literatures to the temperaments of the

¹ Cf. *Miscellany*, III, *Characteristics*, II, 258-9.

² Cf. *Advice to An Author*, *Characteristics*, I, 228.

³ *Second Characters*, ed. Benjamin Rand, 1914, p. 99.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 100.

peoples concerned. This is particularly true of those passages in which he compares the French and English.

'Tis evident our natural genius shines above that airy neighbouring nation, of whom, however, it must be confessed that with truer pains and industry they have sought politeness, and studied to give the Muses their due body and proportion, as well as the natural ornaments of correctness, chastity, and grace of style.¹

The notion that climate has its effect upon literature seems to have had popular appeal at the turn of the century. Bouhours, in his *Les Entretiens d'Ariste et d'Eugène*, has a long discussion on how far national differences in literature are brought about by differences of climate,² and is followed in this by Farquhar³ and Gildon. For, as the last-named says,

. . . as in Physic, so in Poetry, there must be a regard had to the Clime, Nature, and Customs of the People, for the Habits of the Mind as well as those of the Body, are influenced by them.⁴

The subject is treated by Shaftesbury, as by Pope, with good-humoured satire. He speaks of the formlessness of the then popular miscellany and declares that the cause of it must be the variableness of the English climate.

We islanders, famed for other mutabilities, are particularly noted for the variable-ness and inconstancy of our weather. And if our taste in Letters be found answerable to this temperature of our climate, 'tis certain a writer must, in our account, be the more valuable in his kind, as he can agreeably surprise his reader by sudden changes and transports from one extreme to another.⁵

The current depreciation of the critic finds no support in the *Characteristics*. The critic fills a useful and necessary role. Not only does he pass judgement upon contemporary literature, but he educates the taste of the age by drawing attention to the masterpieces of all time.

I take upon me absolutely to condemn the fashionable and prevailing custom of inveighing against critics as the common enemies, the pests and incendiaries of the commonwealth of Wit and Letters. I assert, on the contrary, that they are the props and pillars of this building. . . .⁶

He follows Temple, and many of the other English writers who based their criticism on taste, in declaring that the critic must be a *virtuoso*. By this he means not that the critic must have a specialized knowledge of an antiquarian or historical kind, but that he should be cultured and acquainted with the arts. The *virtuosi* for Shaftesbury are 'the real fine

¹ *Advice to An Author, Characteristics*, I, 142. Vide also *Miscellany*, I, *Characteristics*, II, 160, where he attributes the growth of tragi-comedy in our drama to the natural characteristics of the English.

² Vide *Les Entretiens d'Ariste et d'Eugène*, Amsterdam, 1671, p. 243.

³ Cf. *Discourse upon Comedy; Critical Essays of the 18th Century*, ed. Durham, p. 264.

⁴ *An Essay at a Vindication of the Love-Verses of Cowley and Waller*, 1694; *Critical Essays of the 18th Century*, ed. Durham, p. 4.

⁵ *Miscellany*, II, *Characteristics*, II, 215-16.

⁶ *Advice to An Author, Characteristics*, I, 153.

gentlemen, the lovers of art and ingenuity, such as have seen the world'. They must not become too interested in out-of-the-way speculations and curiosities, or they will degenerate into 'inferior virtuosi', who, 'in seeking so earnestly for rarities . . . fall in love with rarity for rareness' sake'.¹

THE SUBLIME

From 1674, the year in which Boileau translated the treatise *On the Sublime*, the number of references to Longinus and his use of the concept of sublimity increased rapidly. Most of the critics at the time when the *Characteristics* were being written knew the treatise either in Boileau's translation or the original Greek. In the same year, 1674, Boileau published his *Réflexions sur Longin* and Rapin followed him in 1686 with *Du Grand et du Sublime dans les Moeurs et dans les différentes conditions des hommes*.

Dennis was nicknamed 'Sir Longinus', so enthusiastic was he in praise of the Greek critic. Pope, too, refers to Longinus in the *Essay on Criticism*, and so popular has 'the sublime' become by 1728 that he parodies the whole thing with clever irony in *The Art of Sinking in Poetry*. Shaftesbury, along with the rest, was acquainted with *On the Sublime*. Most of the critics of the time, however, use the word 'sublime' with a critical indifference that signifies very little understanding of its true meaning. In this they follow, to some extent, Longinus himself, for he does not penetrate into the aesthetic implications of the concept of sublimity.²

It is our contention that Shaftesbury apprehended the importance of what elements of insight Longinus showed and prepared the way for eighteenth-century considerations of the subject. Shaftesbury uses 'sublime' generally with reference to points of style, and in doing this he follows Longinus for whom the Greek word meant something akin to 'elevation of style'. Although in one place he would seem to suggest that an effect of sublimity can be attained by the use of stylistic devices,³ his general attitude is that it consists rather in emotional appeal wedded to a loftiness of thought and expression. It cannot be analysed by the apparatus of critical method.

The sublime can no way condescend thus, or bear to be suspended in its impetuous course. . . . As for the Sublime, though it be often the subject of criticism, it can never be the manner or afford the means.⁴

¹ *Miscellany*, III; *Characteristics*, II, 252-3. Cf. Pope's well known lines on Hearne in the *Dunciad*, bk. III, ll. 185-94.

² Cf. Bosanquet, *History of Aesthetic*, 2nd ed. 1892, p. 105: 'The philosophical importance of the treatise is rather in its evidence that consciousness has become sensitive in this direction than in systematic insight into the nature of the sublime.'

³ *Advice to an Author*, *Characteristics*, I, 157.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 168-9.

For both Longinus and Shaftesbury true sublimity is related to emotional appeal and to that kind of experience which comes to us when we contemplate the wonderful and tremendous in the natural world. Both critics, too, believe that such an experience follows upon the realization that these phenomena are the manifestation of divine power working in the universe. If Shaftesbury gives no systematic or detailed treatment to the subject of the sublime, at least he anticipates many points that Addison makes in his essays on *The Pleasures of the Imagination*. The awe-inspiring aspects of the natural world and their manifestation of the divine are a constantly recurring topic in *The Moralists* and it is significant that Shaftesbury uses the word 'sublime' to describe such phenomena. But more than anything else, he tells us, it is in the attempt to embrace infinity that we experience the sublime and this comes nowhere so strongly as with the contemplation of the Divine Being manifested in his creation, in the heavenly bodies and the planetary system.

How glorious is it to contemplate him in this noblest of his works apparent to us, the system of the bigger world! . . . Besides the neighbouring planets . . . what multitudes of fixed stars did we see sparkle not an hour ago in the clear night, which yet had hardly yielded to the day? How many others are discovered by the help of art? Yet how many remain still beyond the reach of our discovery! Crowded as they seem, their distance from each other is as unmeasurable by art as is the distance between them and us. Whence we are naturally taught the immensity of that being who, through these immense spaces, has disposed such an infinity of bodies. . . .¹

Addison, in his essays on the *Pleasures of the Imagination*, follows both Longinus and Shaftesbury in discerning that natural phenomena of a tremendous and awful kind, especially when connected with the idea of divinity, afford a peculiar pleasure to the mind. He also relates such an experience to the feeling of astonishment and wonder which formed part of Shaftesbury's definition of the sublime.²

Our Admiration, which is a very pleasing Motion of the Mind, immediately rises at the Consideration of any Object that takes up a great deal of room in the Fancy, and, by consequence, will improve into the highest pitch of Astonishment and Devotion when we contemplate his Nature that is neither circumscribed by Time nor Place, nor to be comprehended by the largest Capacity of a Created Being.³

But it is in the conception of the sublime as that experience which comes to us when we are confronted with natural phenomena that are too large to be comprehended by either the senses or the imagination, and which call forth the powers of the understanding, that Shaftesbury gives a newer and profounder content to the term. It is here we encounter an anticipation, however small, of the views formulated with increasing and

¹ *The Moralists, Characteristics*, II, 112-13.

² *Advice to An Author, Characteristics*, I, 157.

³ *Spectator*, 413; 1713 ed.

142 *The Third Earl of Shaftesbury as a Literary Critic*

progressive profundity by Addison, Burke and Kant. Theocles, in the *Moralists*, addressing nature, gives expression to this novel doctrine.

Thy being is boundless, unsearchable, impenetrable. In thy immensity all thought is lost, fancy gives over its flight, and wearied imagination spends itself in vain. . . . Thus having oft essayed, thus sallied forth into the wide expanse, when I return again within myself, struck with the sense of this so narrow being and of the fulness of that immense one, I dare no more behold the amazing depths nor sound the abyss of Deity. Yet since by thee, O sovereign mind, I have been formed such as I am, intelligent and rational, since the peculiar dignity of my nature is to know and contemplate thee, permit that with due freedom I exert those faculties with which thou hast adorned me.¹

The sublime when used in this sense, of being something too vast to be comprehended by the senses, or the imagination, is applied only to natural objects and not to art. Shaftesbury uses the word 'sublime' when speaking of art, but he holds that the latter can never be sublime in this particular sense. For art must be acceptable to the imagination and its function is to set bounds to the limitless.

. . . the *tò kalón*, the beautiful, or the sublime, in these above-mentioned arts, is from the expression of greatness with order: that is to say, exhibiting the principal or main of what is designed, in the very largest proportions *in which it is capable of being viewed*.²

The similarity of Shaftesbury's remarks to those of Addison in the *Pleasures of the Imagination* is considerable and, when we remember that the latter appeared so soon after Shaftesbury published his work,³ it seems likely that Addison owes some debt to the *Characteristics*. In *Spectator* 412 Addison speaks of the delight which we have in an object that is too big for our imaginations to comprehend and connects this with the feeling of astonishment or amazement.

Our Imagination loves to be filled with an Object, or to grasp at any thing that is too big for its Capacity. We are flung into a pleasing Astonishment at such unbounded Views, and feel a delightful Stillness and Amazement in the Soul at the Apprehension of them. The Mind of Man naturally hates every thing that looks like a Restraint upon it.⁴

Besides this, there are in places striking resemblances of style.⁵ But whether he influenced Addison or not, there is enough to show that Shaftesbury played his part in popularizing the concept of the sublime and investing it with a deeper meaning. The increasing use of the word 'sublime' at the end of the seventeenth century betokens a certain shift

¹ *The Moralists, Characteristics*, II, 98.

² *Freedom of Wit and Humour, Characteristics*, I, 94, n. 3. The italics are mine.

³ *The Moralists* appeared in 1709, and the complete *Characteristics* in 1711. Addison wrote his papers *On the Pleasures of the Imagination* in the *Spectator* in 1712.

⁴ 1713 ed. Cf. Kant, *Critique of Aesthetic Judgment*, trans. J. C. Meredith, Oxford, 1911, p. 98: 'The sublime is that, the mere capacity of thinking which evidences a faculty of mind transcending every standard of sense.'

⁵ Cf. e.g. *Spectator* 420 with the passage quoted above from the *Moralists, Characteristics*, I, 112-13.

of emphasis in the aesthetic judgements that people were making. In the same way that the term *je ne sais quoi* betokens a dissatisfaction with the current critical terminology and its inability to explain the kind of experience that was being felt, so does the concept of the sublime point to a change of taste and sensibility. The lack of precision with which the word was first used indicates nothing more at this stage than an uneasiness of the aesthetic consciousness, but with Shaftesbury, as we have seen, the term is given a more definite content. In his use of the word, but still more in the attitude to nature found in *The Moralists* and associated with it, can be seen the beginning of later discussions of the subject, and hints of the changes that were to take place in the literary taste of the eighteenth century.

THE AESTHETIC SENSE

The position that Shaftesbury occupies in English criticism is in a way peculiar. It was not until his time that criticism became conscious of the more ultimate problems that confronted it. In a word, aesthetic enquiry, in any real sense of the term, began with Shaftesbury. The breakdown of authority in literature set up criticism as an autonomous study which had to find the presuppositions on which to base its enquiries. At once the rival claims of Reason and Taste confronted it. There are those who like to think that the Age of Anne was the Age of Reason and that all literary disputes of the time were settled by the reason. But, as I have tried to indicate above, most of the English critics of the time made a grasp of the actual and experiential an important part of their criticism. Added to this was the growing body of critics who emphasized taste as a matter of personal predilection and individual sensibility.

Shaftesbury stands at the meeting point of this tendency (which we can conveniently call the School of Taste) and the rationalist movement. The School of Taste realized that aesthetic pleasure is a feeling and yet the supporters of reason claimed that if the aesthetic judgement were to be universally valid it must be the product of the reason. Both were right in the assertions they made, but it was not until Kant that the problem was finally seen clearly and an attempt made to answer it. As Bosanquet says, it is

his [i.e. Kant's] system that sets the problem to later modern speculation as a whole, and more especially and distinctively, owing to the peculiar conditions of this problem, to modern aesthetic speculation. 'How can the sensuous and the ideal world be reconciled?' is the general problem; 'how can a pleasurable feeling partake of the character of reason?' is the same problem in its special aesthetic form.¹

¹ *History of Aesthetic*, 2nd ed. 1892, p. 173.

144 *The Third Earl of Shaftesbury as a Literary Critic*

Shaftesbury did not see the nature of the problem at all clearly, but like the eighteenth-century critics he recognized a difficulty in the rival claims of the feelings and reason. In order to escape the difficulty, he advanced the theory of a special sense which apprehends beauty immediately the latter is presented to it.¹ This theory, however, does not solve the problem, but only avoids it. For one thing, the relation of this sense to the reason (as in the case of his moral sense) is never fully discussed by Shaftesbury, although he would not seem to dissociate it from the reason altogether. On the other hand, if it is a sense in the same way as our other senses of sight, smell, physical taste, etc., our aesthetic judgements would be as unrelated to our reason as our tastes in food are, and there would be no possibility of setting up a standard of taste. In fact *de gustibus non est disputandum* would be as true of our artistic opinions as of our tastes in food and drink.

My point in dealing with the doctrine of an aesthetic sense, however, is not to elucidate the philosophical problem or attempt its answer, but to provide further proof of how in the *Characteristics* we can see the rise of eighteenth-century criticism. The tension between the feelings and the reason underlies most of the criticism of the century and many critics, including Welsted, Addison, Hutcheson, John Gilbert Cooper, Blair and Hume, draw upon Shaftesbury's theory of an aesthetic sense. Not only this, but the theory played its part in tying criticism down to the actual and concrete, and giving it that concern for experience rather than laws, which was one of its characteristics in the eighteenth century. Blair summarizes the opinion of a great many writers of the century when he writes,

But, though reason can carry us a certain length in judging concerning works of Taste, it is not to be forgotten that the ultimate conclusions to which our reasonings lead, refer at last to sense and perception.²

CONCLUSION

The change in critical awareness which took place in the eighteenth century is only part of that changing attitude to life itself which has come to be called the Enlightenment or *Aufklärung*. The changing attitude can be seen, too, in the imaginative literature of the time. There is evidence to show that many early eighteenth-century poets were indebted to the

¹ Cf. *The Moralists, Characteristics*, II, 137, where Philocles, one of the characters in the dialogue, says: 'I am ready, replied I, to own there is in certain figures a natural beauty, which the eye finds as soon as the object is presented to it.'

² *Lectures on Rhetoric and Belles Lettres*, 1785, the first essay on *Taste*.

philosophy of Shaftesbury,¹ and the reason is not far to find. He gave to the poets a self-confidence and a belief in the creative activity of the artist denied them by the mechanistic world view of such philosophers as Descartes, Hobbes and Locke. He insists that the artist is a creator, while according to their belief in the mind as a *tabula rasa*, poetry is a mere agglomeration of pleasant images and the imagination an association of ideas. Added to this was the relegation by Locke of the secondary qualities of perception to a subsidiary place in reality. The non-mathematical qualities of sense such as colour, smell, taste, etc. (things so important to the poet), according to this doctrine, were confined to the percipient's own mind and did not belong to substance itself. Shaftesbury's picture of the universe was not that of the great machine running with almost hideous precision, independently of the sustaining force of God. He saw it as the garment which clothes the spirit of a God who is immanent in his creation and whose beauty is disclosed in the harmony of his handiwork.

He, himself, was quite conscious of the difference between the attitude of his own and their philosophy to the arts. In the notes which constitute *Treatise IV* of the *Second Characters* he says

Hence Hobbes, Locke, etc., still the same man, same genus at the bottom.—'Beauty is nothing.'—'Virtue is nothing.'—So 'perspective nothing—Music nothing'.—but these are the greatest realities of things, especially the beauty and order of affections. These philosophers together with the anti-virtuosi may be called by one common name, viz. barbar[ians].²

A characteristic of early eighteenth-century poetry which finds its support in the philosophy of Shaftesbury is the increasing regard paid to the awful and even the ugly elements of nature. I have already endeavoured to show in the remarks above on the Sublime how great was Shaftesbury's veneration for the great and terrifying aspects of the natural world. Such veneration was not a matter of mere personal predilection, but formed part of his philosophical theory. For Shaftesbury evil was nugatory or even illusory, and what passed for examples of evil, according to him, were minor contradictions in a totally harmonious system which embraced and transcended them.³ Thus the terrifying and

¹ Vide articles by C. A. Moore. *Shaftesbury and the Ethical Poets in England, 1700-60*, in *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, xxxi (1916); and *The Return to Nature in English Poetry*, in *Studies in Phil.* (*Univ. of N. Carolina*), xiv, 3 (1917).

² *Second Characters*, ed. Benjamin Rand, 1914, p. 178.

³ Cf. *The Moralists, Characteristics*, II, 22: 'For 'tis not then that men complain of the world's order, or abhor the face of things, when they see various interests mixed and interfering; natures subordinate of different kinds, opposed one to another, and in their different operations submitted the higher to the lower. 'Tis on the contrary from this order of inferior and superior things that we admire the world's beauty, founded thus on contrarieties, whilst from such various and disagreeing principles a universal concord is established.' Cf. also *Advice to An Author, Characteristics*, I, 136, where he tells us that '...knavery is mere dissonance and disproportion.'

ugly elements in nature would turn out on examination and reflexion to have their own species of emotional appeal and pleasure. The counterpart of this optimistic philosophy, which taught that whatever is is right, as far as human nature is concerned leads to the view that virtue consists in the gradual and unhindered unfolding of a man's character. For literary criticism the implications of such a doctrine are that the rules are unimportant. True criticism consists in the appreciation of the man with a wide and liberal culture, in the verdict of the virtuoso. As Professor Irving Babbitt succinctly expresses it,

He undermines insidiously decorum, the central doctrine of the classicist, at the very time that he seems to be defending it. For decorum also implies a control upon the expansive instincts of human nature, and Shaftesbury is actually engaged in rehabilitating 'nature', and insinuating that it does not need any control.¹

The figure of Shaftesbury the critic can never be separated from that of Shaftesbury the philosopher. His criticism forms part of his general attempt to reform the manners and taste of his fellows. But while his criticism, as such, is in the main no more profound than that of many of his contemporaries, the philosophical doctrines behind it did much to decide the nature of the subject's development in the eighteenth century. In his work, too, we come to understand better the background of ideas against which the movement of both literature and criticism must be seen. If the writings of Shaftesbury are no longer of great interest to the general reader, at least they should not be neglected by the student of literature.

R. L. BRETT.

BATH.

¹ *Rousseau and Romanticism*, 1919, p. 45.

SAINT-AMANT'S 'MOYSE SAUVÉ' AND FRENCH BIBLE TRANSLATIONS

THE French Biblical epics of the seventeenth century have been even more neglected than the profane poems, some of which, like *La Pucelle*, *Alaric* and *Clowns*, are well known, if unread. From the point of view of poetic worth, this neglect is no doubt justified. But these poems throw light, which can hardly be found elsewhere, on the tangle of conflicting religious and aesthetic notions which lies beneath the apparent smoothness of seventeenth-century literature. In particular they illuminate the relationship between Protestantism and art and the attitude to the Bible, familiar to all as the sacred book, yet foreign in many essential ways because of moral and aesthetic ideas derived from other sources. As an approach to these problems it might be interesting to take a single instance—the *Moyse Sauvé* of Saint-Amant—and study the use made in it of various modern translations.

Roughly speaking there are three possible sources of Saint-Amant's Biblical material. We can leave aside the possibility of his having read the original Hebrew of the Old Testament. But it is possible that he used the Vulgate, for although he says himself (Livet's edition, I, 12) that the Greek and Latin he had learned at school would never make him look like a pedant, there are traces in his work of knowledge of at least the rudiments of Latin. Moreover, the orthography of proper names in the *Moyse Sauvé* is usually the same as that of the Vulgate, but this, as will be seen, proves little. On the other hand, there was no reason why Saint-Amant should take the trouble to read the Bible in Latin when a large number of modern translations were available. And he himself gives clear evidence that he made use of translations, at least in certain places.

The other two possibilities are that he used (a) a Catholic or (b) a Protestant translation into a modern language. This language was not necessarily French, since he knew Italian, Spanish, and English, apparently well. But here again he was hardly likely to turn to a foreign language, however well he knew it, without some specific reason.

In order to understand the difficulty and importance of the question it will be necessary to give a short sketch of the early history of the Bible in France. The first translation made according to the principles of humanistic scholarship and with some claim to accuracy was by Jaques

Lefèvre d'Étaples and appeared complete in 1530. It soon disappeared owing to the withdrawal of the Imperial privilege: it does not seem to have been reprinted after 1544 and was certainly not used by Saint-Amant. It was, however, the basis of the first French Protestant translation by Pierre-Robert Olivetan, which appeared at Geneva in 1535. It remained the standard Protestant Bible for many years and was frequently reprinted throughout the sixteenth century. Each reprint, however, was in fact a new edition, as the translation was being constantly revised by the *Pasteurs de l'Église de Genève*. The principal editions were those of 1551, 1560, 1565, 1567, 1568 (the *Biblia Latinogallica*, containing both French and Latin translations), 1570 and 1580. Then in 1588 a thorough revision was published by a committee of pastors headed by Bèze. This remained the official Bible until the beginning of the eighteenth century and henceforward only exact reprints were made. In the meantime a Catholic Bible appeared at Louvain in 1550. It was the work of the University (*les Theologiens de l'Uniuersité de Louvain* on the title-page of later editions). This too was based on Lefèvre's translation, but in fact it is very close to Olivetan's version; such differences as there are, are either very slight or have a definite doctrinal significance. But unlike the Geneva Bible it was not subjected to thorough revision, with the result that the early Geneva Bibles are probably closer to the Louvain version than to Geneva Bibles after 1588. It remained the Catholic version until the publication of Le Maistre de Saci's translation (1672). Ostensibly new translations, published in France, like those of René Benoist (1566) and Pierre Frizon (1621), were in fact merely reprints from it.

There are therefore two great divisions of the French Bible up to Saint-Amant's time, the Protestant and the Catholic versions. The former again can be divided into two versions, Olivetan's Bible and the 1588 revision. But it must be remembered that this division is only approximate, owing to the constant process of revision which began before 1588. There was also a rival Protestant translation by Sébastien Chatillon, published at Basle in 1555. It can be left aside for our purpose. It never attained wide popularity and a brief examination was sufficient to show that Saint-Amant could only have used it where it agrees with other versions.

Generally speaking, it would seem more likely that he should use the Catholic Bible, since he was a Catholic and the Geneva Bible was of course forbidden to Catholics. On the other hand, he had been born a Protestant and by now the controversy had died down and was confined to verbal conflict. To decide the question, the most obvious method is

to seek internal evidence in the poem. We might expect to find direct borrowings from the Bible, which by their use of a certain word in a certain context would put the source beyond doubt. Secondly, a comparison of the spelling of proper names in the *Moyse Sauvé* with that of the various translations should be of assistance. Neither of these kinds of evidence is very reliable, however. Saint-Amant rarely imitates the Bible closely enough for a comparison to be possible. He takes a passage and translates it into the poetic style of the seventeenth century. It is plain that it has come from the Bible, but it is impossible to say from which translation. There are, however, one or two cases which give a positive result. The evidence of proper names is more plentiful, but still less reliable, since a spelling may be changed for the sake of metre, euphony or merely caprice.

There are more precise indications in the letter to Samuel Bochart (II, 329). Here Saint-Amant quotes the Italian Bible of Diodati to justify his use of a word:

Pour le vœu que je fais faire à Jacob de bastir un temple, il est très-vray que je n'entens qu'un autel, encore que Diodate (*Genese* 28, 22) le tourne *Casa di Dio*... (II, 330).

Three conclusions follow from this. Diodati was a Protestant and his Bible (first published in 1607) was a direct translation from the Geneva French. Therefore Saint-Amant had used a Protestant Bible and was not afraid of admitting it openly. Secondly, he had read a Bible in a foreign language. It might seem possible, therefore, that this or another Bible, not a French translation, had been his main source. Lastly, and most important, it is clear that he had compared different versions, noting 'altar' in one, 'temple' in another. In fact, therefore, instead of being the careless poet described by Boileau, Saint-Amant had sought scholarly accuracy, had examined different translations and followed the one which seemed best. If this is true, it is clearly useless to try to say with certainty that he used one translation rather than another throughout the poem. These conclusions, however, are modified to some extent by the circumstances in which the reference to Diodati was made. The letter was written after the publication of the poem (it is dated 5 March 1654). There is therefore no proof that a work consulted during the writing of the letter had been consulted during the composition of the poem. More than this, Saint-Amant was answering criticisms made by Bochart, and it may well have been under this stimulus that he attempted to imitate the method of the scholar. It will be seen, therefore, that the possibility of the constant use of an Italian Bible is very remote. Diodati is quoted

here to add weight to an assertion and is compared with another Bible (presumably French), which was the main source. Therefore, even if Saint-Amant consulted Diodati during the writing of the poem, he probably did so for confirmation, not for primary material. It must be remembered, too, that Bochart was a Protestant: Saint-Amant may have quoted a Protestant Bible out of deference to him or because he thought this quotation would carry more conviction. This, however, is not very likely. He quoted Diodati primarily because he gave a version which Saint-Amant had not found anywhere else and which helped him to present his case. The effect of the name of Diodati on Bochart was no doubt a contributory reason. But the important point is that he knew Diodati well enough to turn to him for confirmation and was not afraid to acknowledge this openly. The value of the third conclusion, that Saint-Amant had carefully compared different versions, is also diminished by the fact that this quotation was made after the publication of the poem. But it remains strong enough to cast doubt on any but the most definite evidence of exclusive use of one version. On the other hand, it does not preclude an attempt to establish the relative importance of different versions.

The next direct quotation from the Bible is made in answer to Bochart's criticism of the description of Rachel sitting on her camel (II, 277). In the Bible she stays in her tent, hiding the idols under the trappings or saddle of the camel (Gen. xxxi. 34). This is how Saint-Amant defends himself (II, 333):

Je vous avoue que j'ay eu peur que le mot de *bast* ne sentist l'asne, et que j'ay mieux aymé faillir un peu contre l'histoire en faisant Rachel sur le point de son depart que de le nommer, outre que la maladie qu'elle feignoit avoir ne l'obligeoit point à garder le lit. Neantmoins, si vous jugez que la chose soit de grande consequence, nous changerons cet endroit-là en y mettant *sous la couche les tient*, ou quelque autre mot.

For this word *bast*, the Louvain Bibles and their imitators, Benoist and Frizon, have *litier*, and so have the early Geneva Bibles. *Bast* occurs for the first time¹ in the *Biblia Latinogallica* of 1568 and appears again in the 1588 revision and subsequent editions. This points strongly to the use as main source of a Protestant Bible of 1568, or later, for Saint-Amant is not merely quoting, he is putting forward a word in Holy Scripture, as unalterable, as if there were no alternative. The only way to avoid its use is to change the situation completely. It is true that

¹ For the first time in the text. Several Bibles, including the first edition of 1535 and the Bibles of 1566 and 1567, printed by S. Honorati and François Estienne, give, as a marginal variant of *litier*, '*bast ou paillasse*'. But the very existence of these variants goes to prove that Saint-Amant had only seen a later edition, where *bast* was given as the one authoritative word.

Génébrard's Josephus also has *bast* and Diodati has *basto*, but neither of these could have been alleged as sacred authority. The evidence is not, however, as strong as it appears at first sight. It must be remembered again that Bochart was more likely to be impressed by a quotation from the standard Protestant Bible and to regard it as conclusive. Indeed, in his reply¹ he does not question Saint-Amant's statement and admits that *bast* is not a suitable word for an epic poem, without suggesting that another translation might provide a better alternative. Moreover, Saint-Amant is here on the defensive, making an excuse. He may have known the other version, but not have mentioned it because it would have damaged his defence. Against this the letter displays a remarkable honesty and humility, if also a kind of perverse ingenuity. And he could have found an answer to *litier*e as convincingly as to *bast*. On the whole, then, it is beyond doubt that he used the Protestant Bible and was very familiar with it, though it is not safe to say that he used it exclusively.

A last piece of evidence in the letter to Bochart is the discussion of Jacob's presents to Esau (II. 333):

De plus, quand Jacob (*Genese* 32, 4) envoie vers son frere, il dit bien qu'il y a des bœufs, des asnes, des brebis, des serviteurs et des servantes.

As this enumeration is found in all versions alike, it is not very helpful. But it adds further proof, by the use of their exact words, that Saint-Amant used one of the French translations. This concludes the external evidence, which is very slight, though it all points in one direction. There remains the internal evidence.

There are very few close imitations of the Bible in the *Moyse*, and such as there are are usually minute and unconvincing.

Desormais les agneaux qui naistront marquez
Seront, sans nul debat, a luy seul reputez. (II, 274)

is clearly from Gen. xxx. 35. Here the Louvain Bibles and the early Geneva Bibles, including that of 1568, have *marqués*. But the 1588 and subsequent Geneva Bibles have *marquetés*. This does not prove very much, as the poet may have put in *marquez* for the sake of the metre or because of the growing feeling for precision, which was probably the reason for the change in the Geneva Bible, even though he read *marqués*. On the other hand, the word occurs several times in the chapter and was therefore likely to impress itself on the mind. A similar, but still less convincing, case is the description of Jacob's trick on Laban (II, 275):

En despouille le bois d'escorce revestu,

from Gen. xxx. 37. Here all the Geneva Bibles have *les escorses blanches*,

¹ *Geographia Sacra... cui accedunt variae dissertationes philologicae, geographicae, theologicae, etc*, Lugduni Batavorum, 1692, Cap. XLII, Bocharti ad Sant-Amantium responsio.

but the Louvain Bibles have *les escorcha en partie, decouvrant le blanc*. This suggests that Saint-Amant had read the Geneva version, but the substitution of a noun for a verb is so common that this can hardly be accepted as proof. In the story of Joseph (II, 298) the well is called *puits*. This is only found in the early Geneva Bibles. Those of 1588 and later have *fosse* and the Catholic Bibles *cisterne*. But here we have to deal with a story which enjoyed widespread popularity and the common word *puits* was probably part of the tradition. A more certain indication is the use of the word *bitume* in the making of Moses's cradle,

De bitume enduit (II, 160).

In Exod. ii. 3 the Louvain Bibles and the early Geneva Bibles have *l'enduit d'argille et de poix*, but Geneva Bibles after 1588 have *l'enduisit de bitume et de poix*. On the other hand, Génébrard's Josephus has *l'endurent de bitumen et de poix*, Diodati *bitume* and the Vulgate *lunxit eam bitumine ac pice*.

The evidence provided by the use of the words *éternité* and *l'Eternel* (II, 179) is however practically incontrovertible. Part III of the *Moyse* opens with a very obvious paraphrase of Gen. xxviii. 13:

Jacob, mon cher Jacob, je suis le roy suprême
Qui l'éternité seule a pour son diadème;
Je suis l'unique Dieu qu'Abraham revera,
Et que dès le berceau ton bon père adora.
Je veux, j'ay resolu, d'une faveur immense,
Qu'à toy premier un jour, et puis à ta semence,
Soit en propriété, non sans quelques efforts,
Le fertile terroir où s'allonge ton corps.

This verse in the 1588 Geneva version reads:

Et voici, l'Eternel se tenoit sur icelle, et dit, Je suis l'Eternel, le Dieu d'Abraham ton pere, et le Dieu d'Isaac, ie donnerai la terre sur laquelle tu dors, à toi et à ta postérité. Now it is plain that Saint-Amant's second line only makes sense if he read *l'Eternel* in his Bible. To make this doubly certain we find shortly after (II, 180):

Certes, de l'Eternel la majesté sublime
Reside en ce desert.

This is from Gen. xxviii. 16:

Et quand Iacob fut esveillè de son dormir, il dit, Pour vrai, l'Eternel est en ce lieu, et ie n'en savoye rien.

The use of *l'Eternel* is only found in the Protestant Bibles. It was even a typically Protestant usage. Here, for instance, the Louvain Bibles and the early Geneva Bibles, except that of 1568, have *le Seigneur*, Diodati *il Signore* and the Vulgate *Dominus*, but the 1568 and 1588 Geneva Bibles (with later editions of the latter) have *l'Eternel*.

Up to this point then the evidence, in most cases unreliable but in one

or two conclusive, points definitely to the use of a Protestant Bible as the main source. Even the inconclusive resemblances are sufficient, when taken together, to establish some degree of probability. Where the evidence indicates one Geneva version rather than another it is the revision of 1588 (*bast* and *l'Eternel* also occur in the 1568 edition, but otherwise this edition agrees with earlier ones). The exception is *puits*, which is found only in the earlier editions, but, as we have seen, this is very inconclusive indeed. We can therefore be certain that Saint-Amant knew and used the Bible of 1588 and there is a strong presumption that it was his main source.

Unfortunately the evidence of the proper names considerably disturbs these conclusions. This evidence is of course unreliable, but Saint-Amant is hardly likely to have invented the spellings he employs, and if a certain spelling occurs in one translation and no other, it is safe to assume that he had used it. Most of the names in the poem are common property and there are no variations in the spelling of Moyse, Jacob, Rachel, Laban, etc. It is to the less prominent names that we must turn, names which Saint-Amant could only have found in the Bible. The result of an examination of these names is surprising. Only one seems to be from the 1588 Geneva Bible, Carran (Gen. xxix. 4, *Moyse*, II, 260). There it is spelt Caran, but in other Bibles Haran or Haram (Charan in Diodati). Here the importance of euphony is clear. Carran sounds more French than Haran and fits into an alliteration:

Elle court en Carran.

On the other hand, there are nine names which agree with the spellings of the Louvain Bible, two of them almost exclusively. These are Lya (Gen. xxix. 16, *Moyse*, II, 261) and Luza (Gen. xxviii. 19, *Moyse*, II, 180). For the second, the Protestant Bibles have one syllable, Lus or Luz. The Louvain Bibles usually have Lusa, though there is one case of Luza (1550). Here again metre was important:

Son vieux nom de Luza change au nom de Bethel.

But to have used it, as in the case of Carran, Saint-Amant must have seen it in a Bible and this was almost certainly that of Louvain. There is a Protestant Bible of 1540, with no place given, which has Luza (and also Lia). This, however, seems to be unique, and it is unlikely that Saint-Amant should have used a Bible a hundred years old, when there were numerous modern editions of the Louvain Bible where he would find the same reading. The possibility, however, cannot be entirely left aside. The 1540 edition, of course, has neither *l'Eternel* nor *bast*, so that there is nothing else to support the evidence of these readings.

The Louvain versions have Lia, the Geneva versions (with the exception noted) Lea. This can be ignored, since Leah was well enough known to have acquired a French name which was Lia. (The 'y' was, of course, a matter of personal taste) The same is true of the only spelling exclusively from an early Geneva Bible, Putiphar in the 1551 edition. Later Geneva and Louvain Bibles have Phutiphar, the 1588 revision Potiphar. But Putiphar was already established in the language, whatever the translators might say. There remain seven names which are found alike in the Louvain Bible and the early Geneva Bibles, Bathuel (II, 174), Gessen (II, 209), Sur (II, 218), Amalec (II, 220), Abiron (II, 227), Zelpha (II, 263), Seir (II, 279). That there should be these coincidences is not surprising, when we remember that the Louvain translation was greatly influenced by that of Geneva. But while these names remain fairly constant in the different editions of the Louvain Bible, in the Geneva Bible they do not, owing to the process of revision. Thus, in the 1551 edition we find Gosen for Gessen, Amelec for Amalec, Zilpha for Zelpha. But in the 1559 (Lyons) edition and those editions which were reprinted from it, like those of 1565 and 1580, all these names are the same as in the Louvain Bible. The obvious conclusion to be drawn from this list of names is that Saint-Amant used either the Louvain translation or a Geneva translation published between 1559 and 1588. The evidence for this is of doubtful value when its parts are examined separately, but the fact that the great majority of spellings are to be found in both Bibles establishes a very strong probability. Taking the proper names alone, the chances are rather in favour of the Louvain Bible, seeing that Luza almost certainly comes from it alone. But it is plain that the evidence of these names is exactly contrary to the external evidence and that of imitations in the poem itself.

Several possibilities emerge from these facts. First of all, the Louvain Bible, though it cannot have been used exclusively, may have been the source of the majority of the proper names. We have seen that it has one spelling which it shares only with an old and out-of-the-way Geneva Bible. It must be remembered, too, that the spellings common to both versions are found only in Geneva editions anterior to 1588. Other things being equal, it is more likely that Saint-Amant would have used a recent rather than an old Bible. But, of course, if other things were not equal, there would be no difficulty in supposing that he possessed a Bible fifty or a hundred years old. In any case, if Saint-Amant did take these names from the Louvain Bible, it was because he found them more euphonious and more French. It was certainly not due to motives of Catholic

orthodoxy, as his references to the Protestant Bible prove. Even though the names came from the Louvain Bible, it is highly probable that the Bible which Saint-Amant used most and quoted from most freely was an edition of the Geneva revision of 1588. This combination is not unlikely. The Geneva Bible may have been an old and favourite book. Saint-Amant says that he read the Bible daily when he was on Belle-Isle during the siege of La Rochelle (*Le Contemplateur*, I, 38). If this is so, he probably found the names in it unpoetic and looked for better-sounding ones in the Louvain Bible.

There is another possibility, namely that Saint-Amant used an early Geneva Bible, which combined the orthography of these early editions with the changes in the text made in 1588. If such an edition existed, there would be little doubt that it was that used by Saint-Amant. The only one which approaches it is the *Biblia Latinogallica*, published by Jacques Bourgeois at Geneva in 1568. This Bible is remarkable in having *bast* and *l'Eternel* like the 1588 edition, though it has Haram not Caran. It has of course, like other Geneva Bibles, Lea and Lus. Of the names which Saint-Amant, the Louvain Bible and most early Geneva Bibles have in common it has Bathuel, Zelpha, Seir, Gessen, Sur. For Amalec and Abiron it has Amalech and Abirom. These two are certainly insignificant differences, but Bibles of the same group generally show agreement even in these minute details. In any case, consultation of another Bible was necessary for Luza and Carran. But it is quite possible that Saint-Amant made use principally of the 1568 Bible. A third possibility is that there is another edition, published between 1565 and 1588, which would reconcile the differences. This is a very remote possibility indeed. Of the first two hypotheses neither can be said to be more probable than the other. Whether Saint-Amant habitually used the 1568 or the 1588 Bible, it seems certain that his main source was Protestant and that he consulted other Bibles from time to time.

Saint-Amant was a Protestant converted to Catholicism. The composition of the *Moyse Sauvé*—about 1630 to 1653—fell in the period of truce in the struggle between the two faiths, when it was possible for Protestants and Catholics to collaborate in literature and other ways. Saint-Amant, we have seen, retained many links with Protestantism and his work may be regarded as a synthesis of both. His use of the Bible is a typical example.

R. A. SAYCE.

OXFORD.

Note. The references are to Livet's edition of Saint-Amant's works, 2 vols., Paris, 1855.

LINKS BETWEEN THE 'CONVIVIO' AND THE 'DE VULGARI ELOQUENTIA'¹

A LITERARY language common to the whole of Italy had not yet been formed by the end of the thirteenth century. All that could be found in Italy during the last quarter of this century was several dialects, each supreme in its own region, and many possessing features in common. Some of these dialects, it is true, had been adjusted for literary purposes. In Sicily, in Bologna, in Tuscany, in Lombardy and Venetia, poetry had been written in a language consisting of the local dialect enriched and revised through latinization and borrowings from the vernaculars of other regions, French, and Provençal. But none of these dialects thus raised to literary rank had been able to prevail beyond its regional boundaries, and although poetic Sicilian had influenced the language of the Tuscan lyric, and both the former and the latter that of the Bolognese,² none of them could claim the position of *parler directeur* in the field of letters.

During the last quarter of the century, with the rise of the poetic school commonly known as the *stil nuovo*, a new development took place in one of these literary vernaculars. Side by side with the literary Florentine which had preserved strong parochial features and was stilted and artificial in appearance, so as to be strongly censured by Dante in the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*,³ there arose thanks to the *stil nuovo* a new poetic language. Still basically Florentine, the language of the writers of the *stil nuovo*,⁴ like the other literary dialects of thirteenth-century Italy, interwove into its dialectal foundations features from other neo-Latin literary vernaculars, and, in its own case, poetic Sicilian and Bolognese, and the Tuscan of the poems of Guittone d'Arezzo and his Florentine imitators.

¹ I would like to express my thanks to Professor W. Ll. Bullock for reading the MS. of this article and giving me valuable advice. Although the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* and the *Convivio* have been the subject of much study and research, the close connexion between these two treatises has not, as far as I am aware, been sufficiently stressed yet. Of course, when we consider the immense amount of Dante literature, absolute certainty that one is not repeating views already put forward can hardly be reached. Nevertheless the fact that the most recent and the best known studies on the two treatises do not deal with the points I intend to raise, makes me believe that they have so far escaped the attention of Dante scholars.

² Cf., for instance, the texts in G. Zaccagnini, *I Rimatori Bolognesi del Secolo XIII* (Milano, 1933), *passim*. Some Sicilian influence was also exerted upon the language of some lyrical poetry written in northern Italy during the thirteenth century (G. Bertoni, review of Cesareo's *Le Origini della poesia lirica e la poesia siciliana sotto gli svevi*, *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana*, LXXXV (1925), 130-2).

³ *Vulg. Eloq.* I, xiii, 1. References to Dante's works in this article are according to *Le Opere di Dante—testo critico della società dantesca italiana* (Firenze, 1921).

⁴ On which cf. G. Bertoni, *Lingua e Poesia* (Firenze, 1937), pp. 63-5, G. Bertoni, *Lingua e Pensiero* (Firenze, 1932), pp. 45-64.

Like them it also had recourse to Latin as a normalizing factor and, most important of all, discarded drastically those typically parochial forms which had till then been freely admitted into the language of Tuscan poetry, and those sounds which, in the judgement of the *stilnovisti*, did not possess those harmonious qualities which were deemed necessary to great poetry.¹ Thanks to the exquisite taste and sense of proportion of the poets of the *stil nuovo*, the blending of so many heterogeneous elements had been successfully achieved. Where Guittone d'Arezzo had failed they succeeded, and were able to create a language capable of expressing in terms of great beauty every lyrical mood of the poet's mind.

It was in this language, the harmonious smoothness of which was able to hide successfully its inherent hybridism and artificial origins, that the lyrics of Dante were written. A follower of the ideals of the new school which was freeing Italian poetry from the shackles of Provençal convention, Dante accepted this language as his own poetic *volgare*. Moreover, he enlarged its sphere of influence by extending it to the prose of the *Vita Nuova*,² and used it in all his vernacular works until he was to devise for his *Commedia* a language in which all the conventional and theoretical limitations of the poetic vernacular of his times were set aside.

The language of the *stilnovisti* had found admirers even outside Tuscany. By the end of the thirteenth century followers of it were to be found in various parts of Italy,³ and even in distant Venetia Ildebrandino dei Mezzabati attempted with mediocre success to capture its beauty in his sonnets.⁴ Yet, in spite of this, the use of this language was very far from being established throughout Italy, and even in Tuscany itself it was not practised outside a very small literary clique. Thus, while other neo-Latin countries like France, Provence, and Castile, had secured literary *koinés* during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, Italy was still in a state of linguistic muddle when Dante was embarking upon his literary career. Undoubtedly attempts to form regional dialects had been made almost everywhere in Italy during the thirteenth century; but none of these vernaculars had secured enough prestige to reach national status.

¹ Cf. *Vulg. Eloq.* II, vii, 1-7. Dante's views on words and sounds to be avoided in lyric poetry (*ibid.*, loc. cit.) are mainly inspired by the practice of the *stil nuovo*.

² On which cf. G. Bertoni, *Lingua e Cultura* (Firenze, 1939), pp. 165-222. The language of the prose of the *Vita Nuova* though influenced by Dante's poetic vernacular is, however, somewhat different in texture from it. On Dante's language cf. especially Bertoni, *Lingua e Poesia*, pp. 27-50; E. G. Parodi, 'La rima e i vocaboli in rima della *Divina Commedia*', *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana*, new series, III (1896), 81-156.

³ *Vulg. Eloq.* I, xix, 1.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I, xiv, 7. On Ildebrandino and his poems cf. M. Barbi, *Due noterelle dantesche* (Nozze Rostagno-Cavazza, Firenze, 1898), passim; M. Barbi, 'La questione di Lisetta', *Studi Danteschi*, I (1920), passim.

The difficulties opposing the creation of a literary *koiné* in Italy were many. In France and Castile the rise of literary language had been mainly stimulated by political unity, the vernacular spoken at the court and used in courtly poetry becoming the official language of letters and administration. In Provence a series of brilliant writers had bequeathed their poetic language as the literary instrument of the countries of the Provençal tongue. But none of these advantages had been enjoyed by thirteenth-century Italy. Had the Hohenstaufens continued in their rule over Sicily, poetic Sicilian might have become in time the literary language of Italy. But the courtly poetry of Sicily had been involved in the ruin of Manfredi, and although its language left an echo in the poetic vernaculars of the Italian peninsula, it was an echo becoming increasingly more faint. The absence of a court and of an established literary tradition were not the sole difficulties towards the setting up of a literary *koiné* in Italy. Besides this there was that hostile contempt of men of learning towards the *volgare* which still persisted to some extent as late as the sixteenth century,¹ and the marked preference for French and Provençal as means of literary expression, not only in northern Italy, where local dialects shared many common features with these languages, and where a considerable literary production in these tongues took place during the thirteenth century,² but also, though on a much smaller scale, amongst some Tuscan writers, Rusticiano da Pisa, Paolo Lanfranchi, and Terramagnino Pisano, being typical examples.³ It was against such dangers, against the possibility of French or Provençal establishing itself as the accepted literary language of Italy, against the prejudice of those who were refusing to think except in terms of Latin, and in order to secure the end of linguistic anarchy in literature and the stabilization and acceptance of the *volgare* in which he and the other *stilnovisti* were writing in literary circles throughout Italy, that Dante reacted. It was such a reaction that perhaps above all prompted him to compose the *Convivio* and the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*.

As a devoted lover of his vernacular, of which he realized in full the potentialities as a means of literary expression, Dante was well aware of the continuous changes to which languages were subjected when not bound by the iron rules of *grammatica* as the ancient classical languages had been.⁴ This, and the above-mentioned dangers to which the *volgare* was

¹ For the hostility against the vernacular during the Renaissance cf. V. Cian, 'Contro il volgare', *Studi Letterari e Linguistici dedicati a Pio Rajna* (Firenze, 1911), pp. 251-97.

² Cf. G. Bertoni, *Il Duecento* (Milano, 1939), pp. 15-35, 74-91.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 82-3, 361; G. Bertoni, *I Trovatori d'Italia* (Modena, 1915), pp. 118-22.

⁴ *Vulg. Eloq.* I, ix, 6-11; *Conv.* I, v, 9; cf. also *Paradiso*, xxvi, 124-38.

exposed, moved him to vindicate before his contemporaries the language in which he was writing his masterpieces, and which had not lacked imitators even outside Tuscany.¹ For Dante this vernacular and it alone was to be the highest expression of the national language of Italy, and as such it was to be used by all those accomplished writers who were aiming at *la gloria de la lingua*. There always remains the possibility that besides such reasons Dante was also prompted to such a course as a result of a very subtle estimate of the political potentialities of the *volgare*. With the example of the *Magna Curia* of Frederic II in his mind, he may have perceived in his literary language a unifying element which could, spiritually, pave the way towards that national harmony which formed the ultimate goal of his political aspirations. It was possibly because of this that the *volgare illustre* was also styled by him *aulicum* and *curiale*,² that is to say, worthy to be employed in that court of a supreme ruler in Italy which only existed in his ideals.³

Intrinsically, this *volgare illustre* had had some predecessors outside Italy. It was theoretically similar to the linguistic ideal of Walther von der Vogelweide and of the French court poets of the late twelfth century, a language in which all dialectal features had been eliminated; but in reality it was as conceived by Dante an impossibility, since every language always requires a definite dialect as its base, Florentine being, as we saw, the basic element of Dante's *volgare*. Yet that the *volgare illustre* should be linked to no particular dialect was firmly believed by Dante,⁴ and in holding this view he had medieval language ideals behind him. It was with his mind haunted by the musical beauty of this language, which he compared to the *unum simplicissimum*,⁵ that Dante set out to write the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* and the *Convivio*. In the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* he intended to present his theory of literary language together with digressions on metric and literary technique; in the *Convivio* he meant to display the literary language of Italy in all its glory.

For the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, Dante was relying upon observation and experience rather than upon previous authorities.⁶ Although he made use of several literary sources, and relied on Aristotle and St Thomas Aquinas for all points connected with philosophy,⁷ there is no

¹ Cf. supra, p. 157.

² *Vulg. Elog.* I, xvi, 6.

³ Ibid., I, xviii, 2. On the meaning of *aulicum* and *curiale* cf. *De Vulgari Eloquentia* ridotto a miglior lezione e commentato da Aristide Marigo (Firenze, 1938), pp. 151, n. 11, 154, n. 21. On the *volgare illustre* cf. especially ibid., pp. lxviii-xc; Bertoni, *Lingua e Poesia*, pp. 63-5, M. Casella, 'Il volgare illustre di Dante', *Giornale della Cultura Italiana*, I (1925), 34-40.

⁴ *Vulg. Elog.*, I, xvi, 4.

⁵ Ibid., I, xvi, 5.

⁶ Ibid., I, I, ix, 1.

⁷ A. Ewert, 'Dante's Theory of Language', *Modern Language Review*, xxv (1940), 359.

definite work that can claim to have been Dante's source.¹ Hence the unique character of this treatise, the originality and depth of which are truly astounding when one considers the times in which Dante lived and the meagre philological knowledge at his disposal. The composition of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* has been assigned to 1303-4,² while that of the *Convivio* must have taken place in 1304-7.³ From a chronological standpoint, the two treatises are therefore following each other.⁴ As such it is not to be wondered at that they approach the *volgare* in the same spirit, and that they show complete conformity in their views on literary language in general and the *volgare italicum* in particular. There is, it is true, an apparent contradiction in their statements on the superiority and inferiority of the *volgare* in respect to Latin, the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* holding the former,⁵ and the *Convivio* the latter view.⁶ But this contradiction does not really exist, as was already explained in the sixteenth century by Girolamo Muzio.⁷

The idea of a *volgare italicum* pervades the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*. The *volgare illustre* is praised and described in it, and its use clearly defined. According to Dante this perfect language, in which he saw epitomized 'all that stood highest in Italian spiritual life,'⁸ could be employed both in poetry and prose.⁹ This was not, however, to mean that it was to be used freely by everyone endowed with literary ambitions and in any subject and metre. In poetry, only high and lofty subject-matter was to be written in it, so as not to strike a discordant note between subject and language, and only at the hand of the best poets, the *doctores illustres*, who alone would be qualified to handle it.¹⁰ In the *Vita Nuova* Dante had restricted the field of the vernacular lyric to matters connected with love.¹¹ Subsequent literary experience had made him, however, abandon such a narrow position, as is shown by his *rime*

¹ Some influence was, however, exerted upon Dante by the *Rasos de Trobar* by Raimon Vidal (*ibid.*, p. 357). For other possible sources cf. Mango, *op. cit.*, pp. xxx-xi.

² *Ibid.*, pp. xxii-iii.

³ *Il Convivio*, ed. G. Busnelli and G. Vandelli, vol. I (Firenze, 1934), p. xix.

⁴ Unless, as is also possible, the composition of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* took place after that of the first book of the *Convivio*, cf. Mango, *op. cit.*, p. xx.

⁵ *Vulg. Eloq.* I, i, 4.

⁶ *Conv.* I, v, 12, 14.

⁷ *Battaglie di Hieronimo Mutro Guistinopolitano* (Vinegia, 1582), sig. n 2 r. Cf. also Marigo, *op. cit.*, p. 9, n. 23. Dante's stating that in his attitude towards the *volgare* he had also been influenced by *la benivolenza de la consuetudine, ch  dal principio de la nra vita ho avuto con esso benivolenza e conversazione* (*Conv.* I, xiii, 8) can *prima facie* hardly be reconciled with the theory of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, since the language spoken by Dante since childhood was the Florentine vernacular and not the *volgare illustre*. But in this case Dante was obviously overwhelmed by emotion while proclaiming the excellence of his *volgare*, cf. C. Foligno, 'Dante as a Craftsman', *Italian Studies*, I (1937), 19, and *infra*, p. 163, n. 2.

⁸ *Vulg. Eloq.* I, xvi, 4 and *passim*.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, II, II, 1.

⁹ *Ibid.*, II, i, 1.

¹¹ *Vita Nuova*, xxv, 6.

allegoriche e dottrinali,¹ which included *canzoni* dealing with philosophical topics. Hence when discussing the subject-matter suited to the poetic *volgare illustre* he broadened considerably the boundaries of the vernacular lyric. Besides love, philosophical topics were approved by Dante as subjects suited to lyrical poetry,² and remembering the achievement of that Bertran de Born whom he was to consign to the everlasting horrors of his *Inferno*,³ the praise of mighty deeds of arms.⁴ Naturally only the best metrical form was to be the worthy companion of so beautiful a language. It was because of this that its chosen metre was to be the *canzone*,⁵ that most perfect metric manifestation in the vernacular according to Dante.

Dante quoted several poems in his *De Vulgari Eloquentia* as specimens of the Italian *volgare illustre*. These included verse by Guido delle Colonne and Giacomo da Lentino amongst the Sicilians, the major Bolognese poets of his time, and by Guido Cavalcanti, Lapo Gianni, Cino da Pistoia, and Dante himself.⁶ Of himself Dante quoted lyrics from the *Vita Nuova*, *Rime per la donna-pietra*, *Convivio*, and other *rime*. In these poems according to Dante, who incidentally gives himself as the typical poet on *rectitudo*,⁷ the *volgare illustre* displayed its high virtues, and especially in the *canzoni* later included in the *Convivio*,⁸ in which command over the language, and ability to express poetically the intricacies of scholastic reasoning, had reached the greatest heights hitherto achieved in an Italian vernacular.

So much for Dante's theories on the poetic *volgare*, in which he saw the means to stabilize the language.⁹ Greater difficulties are to be encountered in connexion with his views on prose *volgare*. These are mainly due to the fact that the section of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* which was to be dedicated to prose writing in general and *prosa illustre* in particular was never written. Yet it is not impossible to surmise what would have been his ideas on the subject of prose, in which according to him the true powers of the *volgare* would have been revealed, powers which were prevented from expressing themselves in full in poetry owing to the tyranny of metre.¹⁰ As Marigo conjectured,¹¹

alla prosa illustre sarebbe stato dedicato, come pensò anche il Rajna, il terzo libro; e per essa la trattazione rettorica fatta dal Latini nel *Tresor* per insegnare, colla guida dei precetti classici, come si devono esporre i pensieri ed esporli con ornata eloquenza

¹ Cf. *Le Opere di Dante—testo critico della società dantesca italiana*, pp. 87–92.

² *Vulg. Elog* II, ii, 5, 8.

³ *Inferno*, xxviii, 118–42.

⁴ *Vulg. Elog* II, ii, 8–9.

⁵ *Ibid.*, II, iii, 10.

⁶ *Ibid.*, *passim*.

⁷ *Ibid.*, II, ii, 9.

⁸ Although one of the *canzoni* of the *Convivio* is quoted in the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* (*infra*, p. 162, n. 2), this does not mean that the treatise has already been written.

⁹ *Conv.* I, xiii, 6–7.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, I, x, 12.

¹¹ Marigo, *op. cit.*, pp. cxvii–cxviii.

nell' orazione volgare, avrebbe forse suggerito qualche spunto... è verosimile che pensasse di aggiungere qualche cenno sull' epistola dettatoria, il genere letterario di stile ornato, parallelo all' orazione (*Conv.* II, XI, 4; *Tresor*, p. 526); e presentare, forse come modello illustre, la prosa della *Vita Nuova*, ritmica e poeticamente immaginosa, vicina (se ci si fermi agli elementi esteriori) alla prosa del Latino dettatorio.

It is indeed quite likely that just as some of the poems of the *Vita Nuova* had been cited by Dante as models of poetic technique in the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*,¹ its prose would have been quoted as an example of *prosa illustre*. But it is even more probable that just as other poems by Dante quoted in the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* were referred to as illustrations of technical points, while it is one of the *canzoni* of the *Convivio* that is cited as an example of the perfect construction required by the *volgare illustre*,² so the prose of the *Convivio* would in all probability have been indicated as the typical *prosa illustre*,³ since it was in the *Convivio* that Dante meant to show in practice his theories on the highest forms of literary language, and the prose of this treatise was connected with the language of its *canzoni* just as the prose of the *Vita Nuova* had been influenced by the language of its poetic section. That this was to be one of the roles of the *Convivio* is suggested by several passages in that treatise. Dante stated in the *Convivio* that its aims were to inspire a love for learning in those who had little knowledge and no Latin;⁴ this he intended to achieve through placing at their disposal learned topics generally treated in the recognized language of culture, and through explaining the allegory of the *canzoni* included in it;⁵ in short, to compose a treatise placing some aspects of culture at every man's disposal. It was because of this that the *Convivio* was written in *volgare*. This had not, however, been the sole reason which moved Dante to express in vernacular what had up to then been rendered in Latin. Besides this there were other

¹ *Vulg. Eloq.* II, viii, 8, xi, 8, xii, 3.

² *Ibid.* II, II, 6.

³ Although the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* was probably begun before the *Convivio* (supra, p. 160) Dante was still working at it when composing his Italian treatise (infra, p. 166) so that it would have been possible to refer to the prose part of the *Convivio* in the section on *prosa illustre* of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, had such a section been written.

⁴ *Conv.* I, vii, 12, ix, 7. The diffusion of scientific knowledge among the unlettered through the vernacular had already been attempted by Brunetto Latini with his *Tresor*, and later by Ser Vivaldo Belcazer of Mantua with his translation of Glanville's *Encyclopedia*. The necessity of diffusing scientific knowledge by means of the *volgare* was stressed later by Guido da Pisa, cf. A. Sacchetto, 'L' idioma nostro nel pensiero di Dante', *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana*, XC (1927), 67-9. As for his readers and aims, Dante had particularly in mind 'd' illuminare i nobili nel loro ufficio di reggere i popoli, di suscitare nelle donne il sentimento della loro missione nella società... e di far fiorire dovunque cortesia e bei costumi, bisogna aver presente nel ricercare quale potè essere il piano concepito da Dante per il suo *Convivio*' (*Il Convivio*, ed. G. Busnelli and G. Vandelli, vol. I, p. xli). Cf. also one of the reasons which moved Francesco da Barberino to write vernacular poems: 'Rimas autem vulgares ad nobilium utilitatem qui latinum non intelligunt scribere volui' (*I Documenti d' amore di Francesco da Barberino a cura di F. Egidi*, vol. I, Roma, 1902-3, p. 36). For Dante's aims cf. also *Il Convivio*, ed. cit. vol. I, pp. xxxii-xxxiii, xxxix-xli.

⁵ *Conv.* I, i, 18, ii, 17.

motives as well, such as the fact that Latin would have been unsuited for the commentary on vernacular poems, Dante's devotion to his own speech,¹ and his desire to write an apology of the *volgare* against the attacks of ill-wishers and the claims of other languages.² Against the Latin, French, and Provençal claims to literary monopoly, the *Convivio* was to be the challenge of the *volgare illustre*, an invitation to show cause why equal rights in the literary field should not be recognized for it too. Composed in a *più alto stilo*³ than the *Vita Nuova*, and in order to *magnificare il volgare*,⁴ it was to show, as the passages including the aforementioned points indicate, Dante's literary language, the language praised and advocated in the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, at its best in prose and poetry.⁵ It was its object to show the potential powers of the *volgare* of Italy translated into act,⁶ and while writing the *Convivio*, Dante felt that he had succeeded in capturing its elusive beauty.⁷

When Dante was writing, Latin was still enjoying a monopoly over all subjects of a learned nature. To it and it alone was attributed the power to express the finer shades of thought, a power which was generally denied by common opinion to the vernacular languages.⁸ Dante was well acquainted with this view. Hence, although he had no doubts that his own *volgare* was the best in the neo-Latin world because of its closeness

¹ *Conv.* I, x, 5

² *Ibid.*, I, x, 12, xi, 14. Another reason was Dante's desire to restore his reputation which he felt was in decay owing to his exile (*Il Convivio*, ed. G. Busnelli and G. Vandelli, vol. I, p. xxxii). It may also be suggested that Dante, who considered himself the poet of *rectitudo* (supra, p. 161), was meaning to show in the *Convivio* that branch of lyric poetry for which he felt he was best suited and a commentary which was to form its prose counterpart, so that altogether the treatise would show him at his best as both poet and prose writer. Although Dante's apology makes no distinction between spoken and literary *volgare*, the difference between them had already been realized in the *Vita Nuova* (Ewert, op. cit., p. 355). Dante follows the *cursus* in the prologue of the *Convivio* (A. Schaffini, *Tradizione e Poesia*, Genova, 1934, p. 168). It is possible that in this Dante was following St Thomas Aquinas who wrote the prologues of both the *Summa Theologica* and *De Unitate Intellectus* in conformity with the rules of the *cursus*.

³ 'convienmi che con più alto stilo dea, ne la presente opera, un poco di gravezza, per la quale paia di maggiore autoritate' (*Conv.* I, iv, 13).

⁴ 'Mossimi prima per magnificare lui. E che in ciò io lo magnifico, per questa ragione vedere si può' (*ibid.*, I, x, 7).

⁵ 'Che per questo comento la gran bontade del volgare di sì (si vedrà), però che si vedrà la sua virtù' (*ibid.*, I, x, 12)

⁶ 'E questa grandezza do io a questo amico, in quanto quello elli di bontade avea in potere e occulto, io lo fo avere in atto e palese ne la sua propria operazione, che è manifestare concepata sentenza' (*ibid.*, I, x, 9).

⁷ 'si come sarà questo comento, nel quale si vedrà l'agevolezza de le sue sillabe, le proprietadi de le sue co(stru)zioni e le soavi orazioni che di lui si fanno; le quali chi bene agguarderà, vedrà essere piene di dolcissima e d' amabilissima bellezza' (*ibid.*, I, x, 13).

⁸ Cf. for instance, Aegidius Romanus, *De Regimine Principum*, I, 2, *Il Fiore di Rettorica di Frate Guodotto da Bologna*, ed. B. Gamba (Bologna, 1824), p. 21; *Fiore di Virtù*, quoted in H. F. Muller, *A Chronology of Vulgar Latin* (Halle, Saale, 1929), p. 152; Fra Iacopo Passavanti, quoted in F. D'Ovidio, *Versificazione italiana e arte poetica medievale* (Milano, 1910), p. 553.

to Latin and the excellence of its lyric poetry,¹ he did not somehow dare to outrage the feelings of his 'orthodox' contemporaries by claiming that it possessed the same powers of expression enjoyed by Latin. Although he disclaimed superiority and even parity with Latin in theory,² he nevertheless did not go very far from asserting it in practice when he declared that the vernacular of the *Convivio* was almost as excellent as the language of ancient Rome in reproducing the intricacies of abstract thought in actual words.³ This was furthermore implied by his writing in vernacular what was really a treatise dealing with some aspects of scholastic philosophy and according to the method of the medieval schools, since by doing this he was claiming for his *volgare* the right to enter the sphere of studies hitherto only pursued in Latin.⁴ Thus one conclusion may be reached from all this, that the *Convivio* was to be the appendix, the *pièce justificative*, the practical counterpart of the Latin treatise. It was there that the *vulgare italicum* would be seen in prose and verse, and dealing successfully with subject-matter never handled before in the vernacular. The connexion between the language of poetry and that of prose, and the influence of the former upon the latter,⁵ which had been first suggested to Dante by Isidore's *Etymologiae*,⁶ was to be openly displayed there; moreover, it was to show what Dante meant to be the highest linguistic manifestation of Italy stabilized into a *gramatica* through the agency of poetry,⁷ and thus safeguarded against those continual changes which were noted in both treatises,⁸ and against which *gramatica* alone was immune. To those Italians who affected a preference for the languages of France and Provence, it was to be a reproach and an invitation to accept their own language as a literary instrument. But above all it was the passionate plea of a man in love with his own language who, convinced of its intrinsic greatness, was striving to convert his fellow-countrymen to his views. It was this love and enthusiasm that made him write of the future mission of the *volgare* as foreseen by him:

Questo sarà quello pane orzato del quale si satolleranno migliaia, e a me ne superchieranno le sporte piene. Questo sarà luce nuova, sole nuovo, lo quale surgerà là

¹ *Vulg. Eloq.* i, x, 4.

² 'lo latino molte cose manifesta concepute ne la mente che lo volgare far non può' (*Conv.* i, v, 12).

³ *Ibid.*, i, x, 12; cf. also *ibid.*, iv, xxi, 6.

⁴ Already in the *Vita Nuova* Dante had claimed that the rhetorical schemes used in Latin could be employed in the vernacular (*Vita Nuova*, xxv, 7).

⁵ *Vulg. Eloq.* ii, i, 1.

⁶ *Isidori Etymologiarum Libri XX*, i, xxxviii, 2.

⁷ *Conv.* i, xiii, 6-7; ii, xi, 9. Already Peter Helyas had acknowledged the possibility to apply the *ars gramatica* to the *volgare* (Marigo, op. cit., p. xxxiv, n. 2) and this had been done in practice for Provençal by Uc Faidit in his *Donatz Proensal* printed in E. Stengel, *Die beiden ältesten provenzalischen Grammatiken* (Marburg, 1878), pp. 1-66.

⁸ *Supra*, p. 158, n. 4.

dove l' usato tramonerà, e darà lume a coloro che sono in tenebre e in oscuritate, per lo usato sole che a loro non luce.¹

Although Dante never stated it explicitly, the connexion between the *Convivio* and the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, and the intimate links between the two works, is evident. Apart from the points already brought forward in support of such a view, it would seem unlikely that these two works composed practically following one another, in both of which the *volgare* was praised and discussed, were not part of one major scheme, i.e. the vindication of the *volgare* of Italy. Had it not been so, what need was there for the defence of the *volgare* in the first book of the *Convivio*?² When Dante wrote the *Vita Nuova*, which like the *Convivio* consists of poems and their prose commentaries, and in which incidentally an interest in linguistic matters already appears,³ the need for such an apology was not felt. Why then, if not for such a reason as suggested above, does the *Convivio* defend the employment of the vernacular in its prose sections and stress the ability of its prose to render the *lingua di sì* in its full beauty?⁴ The answer to this seems to be because the mission of the *Convivio* was *inter alia* to supplement the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, the composition of which it actually mentions,⁵ in the glorification of the Italian *volgare*. The reference to the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* in the *Convivio* is particularly important because it emphasizes the close links between the two treatises through its implied hint that perhaps the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* was also meant, among other things, to be a defence of the language of the *Convivio*, though, being addressed to scholars, it was written in Latin. Indeed, this reference to the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* seems to imply a desire to explain on scientific lines some problems connected with the *volgare* which were merely touched in the *Convivio*, so that also those scholars who held the vernacular in contempt might be converted to Dante's views. Although it seems probable that the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* was started before the *Convivio*,⁶ such an intention is not to be ruled out.

¹ *Conv.* I, xiii, 12. On this passage cf. *Il Convivio*, ed. G. Busnelli and G. Vandelli, vol. I, p. 85, n. 6.

² *Conv.* I, v, 1-xiii, 12

³ *Vita Nuova*, xxv, passim. Dante's intention of composing the *Vita Nuova* in *volgare* had been discussed with Guido Cavalcanti, who had encouraged it (*ibid.*, xxx, 2-3). It is true that, as Professor Foligno remarks, 'at the time of the *Vita Nuova* he had put forward a subtle and almost tentative plea for his use of the vernacular in a prose commentary' (Foligno, *Dante as a Craftsman*, p. 18), but the difference between this and the defence of the *volgare* in the *Convivio* is very great.

⁴ *Conv.* I, x, 12.

⁵ *Ibid.* I, v, 10. It seems likely that 'libello ch' io intendo di fare, Dio concedente, di Volgare Eloquenza' (*ibid.*, loc. cit.) refers to the completion of the treatise rather than to an intention of writing it at a future date. On this passage cf. *Il Convivio*, ed. G. Busnelli and G. Vandelli, vol. I, p. 34, n. 1, and Marigo, *op. cit.*, p. xx.

⁶ *Supra*, p. 160.

For there must have been a time when Dante was engaged on both treatises—let it be remembered that both works were left uncompleted—so that it would seem only natural that while working on the *Convivio* he may have been reserving for the other work which was still unfinished the discussion of points connected with the *volgare* which were arising as he went on with his composition, and which could not be suitably discussed at length in the Italian treatise. Both works were probably to be parts of one single scheme, the promotion of linguistic unity in the highest manifestations of Italian literary life, the possibility of which was shown to Dante by the examples of Latin, the other neo-Latin languages, and the poems of the *doctores illustres* of Italy, which in the transcripts by Tuscan scribes showed a linguistic unity which possibly, as Schiaffini hinted,¹ first gave Dante the idea of the *volgare illustre*. But this scheme, as already suggested,² was possibly aiming even further than the province of language and letters in its ultimate ends. Through the stabilization of literary language, it may have meant to foster a bond of spiritual unity throughout the country, and so start a conscious feeling of a common heritage, thus paving the way towards that national harmony which was later pleaded with so much passion in the *Monarchia* and the *Commedia*,³ and to inaugurate a new era in scholarship through the acceptance of Italian as a learned language.⁴

Common links between the two treatises are furthermore emphasized by a common peculiarity. Both works were left uncompleted by Dante. The actual reasons that led to this are unknown. It has been commonly assumed that Dante interrupted their composition in order to dedicate all his energies to the *Commedia*.⁵ But was this so? While engaged on the *Commedia* Dante still found time to compose the *Monarchia*;⁶ hence could this alone be the real reason that induced him to give up his grandiose scheme of fostering the unity of literary language in Italy, a

¹ A. Schiaffini, *Testi Fiorentini del Duecento e dei Primi del Trecento* (Firenze, 1926), p. xlv. For the language of the manuscript *canzonieri* cf. especially Bertoni, *Lingua e Poesia*, pp. 64–5; E. G. Parodi, 'Rima siciliana, rima aretina e bolognese', *Bullettino della Società Dantesca Italiana*, new series, xx (1913), 126–8; I. Sanesi, 'Il toscaneggiamento della poesia siciliana', *Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana*, xxxiv (1899), 354–67.

² *Supra*, p. 159.

³ On the possible political implications of the *volgare illustre* cf. also Bertoni, *Lingua e Poesia*, pp. 36–7; Marigo, *op. cit.*, pp. lxxxii–lxxxvi.

⁴ This may be surmised from *Conv.* i, xiii, 11–12.

⁵ Bertoni, *Lingua e Poesia*, p. 75, *Il Convivio*, ed. G. Busnelli and G. Vandelli, vol. i, pp. lvi–lvii.

⁶ The date of composition of the *Monarchia* is still the subject of debate. It seems, however, certain that it was written while Dante was engaged on the *Commedia*. For the various dates suggested cf. C. Foligno, 'Notes on the date of composition of the *De Monarchia*', *Dante—Essays in Commemoration, 1321–1921* (London, 1921), pp. 143–56; N. Zingarelli, *La vita, i tempi e le opere di Dante* (Milano, 1931), ii, 709, n. 1.

scheme to which he had dedicated long and painstaking studies and meditations. Was it not perhaps that another motive led him to do it? Both the treatises are products of the early period of Dante's exile, when he was ceaselessly wandering through central and northern Italy seeking refuge from the adversities of fortune, thus continually increasing that knowledge of Italian dialects which is so strikingly exhibited in the first book of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*.¹ Is it not possible that such an increased knowledge, as well as other reasons, was instrumental in making him change his views on literary language, and consequently as a matter of course set aside unfinished his two treatises? That some change in Dante's views on the language of letters had occurred by the time he started the *Commedia* is shown by his not writing it in the *volgare illustre*. It is true that Dante is supposed to have chosen the 'mediocre style' for it.² But, on the other hand, it seems hardly likely that he would not have adopted what he considered at the time to be the most perfect expression of the Italian vernacular for what he knew would be his greatest masterpiece.

APPENDIX

Dante and the Rasos de Trobar

Dante's use of Raimon Vidal's *Rasos de Trobar* in the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* was shown by Professor Ewert.³ Perhaps the influence of this treatise on the Florentine poet was not limited to the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*. If we look at the *Rasos de Trobar*, we shall find that the introductory part of this handbook on poetics includes a defence of *Lemosi* as the literary language of Provençal-speaking countries. After stating that *Lemosi* was the literary tongue of Provence, and the best 'per far vers et cansons et serventes',⁴ Vidal goes on to defend the vocabulary of this dialect against those who were trying to deny it some of its words on the

¹ *Vulg. Elog.* I, x, 5-xv, 8.

² Concerning the language of the *Commedia*, Dante stated in his letter to Cangrande that it was 'ad modum loquendi, remissus est modus et humilis, quia locutio vulgaris in qua et muliercule comunicant' (*Epistole*, XIII, 31), but this does not necessarily imply that he referred here to the 'humble style' which was, according to his original scheme, to be dealt with in the fourth book of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* (*Vulg. Elog.* II, iv, 6). Bertoni rightly suggests that 'quando ebbe inizio la Divina Commedia, le discussioni sul volgare illustre, le disquisizioni sugli stili, gli sforzi dietro le funzioni dell' intelletto vennero distrutti di colpo nell' anima e nella mente di Dante. Cedevano le astrazioni, soprafatte dalla vita, si frantumavano gli schemi, si spezzavano gli ostacoli' (Bertoni, *Lingua e Poesia*, p. 75). It seems therefore likely that the abandonment of the *Convivio* and the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* may have been due to the fact that Dante, before starting on the *Commedia*, had ceased to believe in the *volgare illustre* as defined in his Latin treatise. Cf., however, M. Casella, 'Sul testo della Divina Commedia', *Studi Danteschi*, VIII (1924), 64-6.

³ *Supra*, p. 160, n. 1. The *Rasos* is printed in Stengel, *op. cit.*, pp. 67 ff.

⁴ C. Appel, *Provenzalische Chrestomathie* (Leipzig, 1930), p. 196.

grounds that they also occurred in other Provençal vernaculars, ending with a short panegyric inspired by the grammatical regularity of *Lemosí*. The difference between the vindication of *Lemosí* in the *Rasos de Trobar* and that of the *volgare* in the *Convivio* is very great, Dante's occupying eight chapters while Vidal's hardly runs to one printed page. Yet when we consider that Dante used the *Rasos* for his *De Vulgari Eloquentia*, the composition of which was more or less contemporary with that of the *Convivio*, it seems quite possible that the idea of including an apology of the Italian *volgare* in the introductory book of the *Convivio* was suggested to him by his study of Vidal's treatise, a work which had also influenced the scheme of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia*.

R. WEISS.

LONDON.

MODERN GREEK ORAL VERSIONS OF APOLLONIOS OF TYRE

CONCERNING the wanderings of the story of Apollonios, Prince of Tyre, on European soil I have nothing here to add to the much that has been written.¹ The object of this paper is to describe the versions of the story recorded in recent years from Greek oral tradition, and their relation to a very fine example, not yet published, collected some years ago at the village of Asphendiou in the island of Kos. All these versions, I may say at once, are derived from a rhymed version printed several times at Venice, first in the year 1534.²

It is generally agreed that the first Apollonios of Tyre was a Greek novel such as have survived from the pens of Achilles Tatius, Heliodorus or Longus; this Greek original has been lost, but may have been written by a pagan from Asia Minor. Some time in the fifth century of our era it was put into Latin, later elements being added to the original text. This Latin version became immensely popular, and is found translated into almost every European language. In England it gave Shakespeare the plot of *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*. This part of the subject I can leave aside, but it will be well at this point to give a brief outline of the story as it appears in the Latin text.³

King Antiochus of Antioch incestuously became the lover of his own daughter. In order not to be troubled by suitors for her hand, he propounded a riddle to anyone who presented himself: the riddle at the beginning of Shakespeare's *Pericles*, the answer to which is that it describes the ambiguous position of the daughter. If a man could not answer it, he was beheaded; and even if anyone had answered it, Antiochus would still have had his life. Apollonius, Prince of Tyre, came and guessed the riddle which told him of the king's wickedness. Antiochus, instead of playing fair, sent his servant Thaharchus to kill Apollonius, who, however, fled away in a richly laden ship, and the king had to be content with setting a price on his head.

Apollonius came to Tarsus where a citizen called Hellenicus warned him of his danger. He met his friend Stranguilio with his wife Dionysias, and used his cargo of corn to relieve the famine in the town. Then he sailed away for Pentapolis, but on the way was shipwrecked and cast up near Cyrene. A kindly fisherman helped him to go to the court of King Archistrates to whom he commended himself by his skill as a masseur and by his other accomplishments. He and the king's daughter Archistratis fell in love; and he lived in the palace as her music master. Three suitors then appeared for the hand of the princess, but she let her father know that she would marry no one but Apollonius, to which the king consented. Presently messengers came with news of the death of the wicked king and his unfortunate daughter by a thunderbolt, and that Apollonius is summoned to be king. So the prince and his wife and the midwife Lycoris set off; but another storm arose and after giving birth to a daughter the

¹ See A. H. Smyth, *Shakespeare's Pericles and Apollonios of Tyre*, Philadelphia, 1898; also S. Singer, *Apollonius von Tyrus*, Halle, 1895.

² For the editions, see Legrand's *Bibliographie hellénique*.

³ I have used the text of *Hist. Apollonii regis Tyri*, ed. A. Riese, 1893.

mother died. Apollonius put her body into a chest and cast it into the sea. In due course it was washed up at Ephesus, and a clever disciple of the physician Chaereon brought her to life again. The lady was then placed among the priestesses in the temple of Diana. Apollonius continued his voyage, came to Tarsus and gave the baby girl, whom he had called Tarsia, to his friends Stranguilho and Dionysias to be brought up with their own daughter Philotimias; with her he left the nurse and midwife Lycoris.

On her deathbed the nurse told Tarsia the real story of her birth; she then died and was buried close to the sea. As Tarsia grew up she proved notably more beautiful than her foster-sister, and all were jealous of her. Her foster-mother, Dionysias, ordered the slave Theophilus to take her away and kill her, while they celebrated a sham funeral. Theophilus spared the girl, and pirates appeared who carried her away to Mitylene, where she was sold to the leno Ninus. Athenagoras, the prince of the city, had bid for her against Ninus; he protected her in all her trials and she was able to retain her honour: finally, Ninus allowed her to earn him money by entertaining visitors with her music.

Fourteen years later Apollonius went again to Stranguilho; he was told of his daughter's death by sickness and taken to her alleged tomb. As he was returning to Tyre a contrary wind carried him to Mitylene. He was too melancholy to land himself, but from one of his servants, Ardahio, Athenagoras learned his name and perceived that he must be the father of Tarsia. The girl was sent to the ship to console him with her music, and by riddling verses and by recounting her story forced him to recognize his lost daughter. The leno was then burned alive and Athenagoras took Tarsia as his wife.

To bring Apollonius to Ephesus a dream is used; at its bidding he went there and in the temple saw Archistratus, whom he took to be Diana herself. She then revealed herself and all the three were united. Apollonius assumed the crown of Antioch and conferred upon Athenagoras and his daughter the kingdom of Tyre. Then they all went to Tarsus, and Stranguilho and Dionysias were brought up for trial. Tarsia dramatically unveiled herself as one brought back from the dead; Theophilus gave his evidence, and the guilty pair were condemned to death by stoning. Apollonius then went to Cyrene, and sought out and rewarded the kindly fisherman. Archistrates died, bequeathing his kingdom to Apollonius and his wife, who lived as rulers of Antioch and Cyrene. Lastly, to give authenticity to the story, we are told that Apollonius wrote an account of his adventures: one copy he deposited in the temple of Diana at Ephesus, the other he placed in his own library.

Such is the story; the nearest we can get to the original Greek. It is full of adventures, storms at sea and coincidences, yet in tone rather dry, and in parts reading more like an epitome than a full translation of the original. The essential incidents, appearing in all the subsequent versions presently to be examined, are the birth of a daughter at sea, the supposed death of the mother, the loss of the girl, her resistance to all attempts on her virtue, and the final general recognition and the happy ending of the whole story.

The one European wandering of this story which concerns us is that it made its way to Venice, after the fall of Constantinople a notable centre of Greek printing. There the family of Glykys from Jánina issued many books, mainly of a popular character, for the use of Greeks living under Turkish rule. These books, no doubt read to death by people who were hardly bibliophiles, are all of them now quite scarce, some very rare indeed. In 1534, as I have already said, the rhymed version of the

Apollonius story appeared, and it was reprinted several times in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries; the latest edition I can find is of 1805. An edition of 1745 is now among Bywater's books in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. Its title runs: 'Απολλωνίου τοῦ ἐν Τύρῳ, Ρημάδα.¹

But this *rimada*, this story in rhyme, is by no means a mere translation of the original. Very much in contrast to the dry preciseness of the Latin, it is a work of a strongly romantic, chivalrous tone with the freest modifications of the story. Parallel with it is another verse translation preserved in a MS. of the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century now at Paris, and published by Wagner.² It keeps much more closely to the original than the *rimada*, but is of no importance here because all the Greek oral versions are very clearly based on the Venice book. The exact source of the Venice *rimada* is not clear: Smyth thinks it must be left doubtful; Singer apparently believes that the Paris manuscript and the *rimada* are made from two separate Italian versions, themselves from a French text.³

The numerous editions show that the Glykís *rimada* was as popular in Greece as the story had proved in Europe, and the same thing is indicated by the fact that in recent years the tale of Apollonius has several times been recorded as a folk-tale or ballad, and printed in collections of such things. From Crete we have it as a ballad, and from Kýthera and Aivali (Kydonía), in Asia Minor, as a folk-tale.⁴ It is curious to note that at Aivali it has found its way back to the probable country of the original inventor of the story.

But before discussing these Greek oral versions, we must see how the Venice *rimada* modified the Latin original; how the story was adapted to the taste of the popular Greek world, at that time to some extent westernized by the Frankish culture which had flooded the Levant both before and after the crusades. A taste for romantic, chivalrous poems had grown up, a good deal in the Frankish style. There was a supply of such works, some few of them modernizations of native Greek stories like the *Achilleis*, with a tournament quite in the western style, most of them frankly importations from the west: the *Cantare di Florio e Bianciflore* produced *Phlorios and Platziaphlora*; *Pierre de Provence et la belle Maguelonne*

¹ Much information on the Glykís books is contained in Legrand's *Bibliographie hellénique*.

² W. Wagner, *Medieval Greek Texts*, pp. 57-104; also in his *Carmina Graeca Medii Aevi*, pp. 248-76.

³ Smyth, *op. cit.*, p. 45, also Singer as quoted by Politis in *Λαογραφία*, I, 77, with a reference which I cannot trace.

⁴ Both versions of the Cretan ballad are in 'Ο Κρητικός Λαός, I, 7 and 77; the Aivali version has been published in a German translation in J. G. von Hahn's *Griechische und albanesische Maerchen*, I, 273-84, no. 50.

appeared as *Imberios and Margarona*. There were plenty more, and finally, in the seventeenth century, Cornaro wrote the great Cretan romantic epic, *Erotókritos*, 'The man tormented by love', founded, as has been lately discovered, on a French romance *Paris et Vienne*.¹ It was for this world that the dry precise Latin Apollonius had to be prepared, and a good deal naturally had to be done to it. First, the poem had to be christianized. a prologue and an epilogue on the duty of trusting in God have been added; Apollonius' infant daughter is christened; when the mother recovers from her apparent death she is no longer put among the priestesses of Diana; she becomes a nun and then the abbess of her convent. Fresh local colour is freely applied. When Apollonius goes to the court of King Archistrates and falls in love with his daughter, a tournament is inserted at which he may show his manly valour in the presence of his lady, quite in the western style of chivalry. There are no notable omissions, but the early part of the story is rather padded out with soliloquies and moral reflexions quite alien to the drier Latin, while towards the end a good deal of cutting has been done. The adapter apparently was getting tired of his work. The riddle at the beginning is mentioned but not given, and Tarsia's enigmatic rhymes sung to her father before he recognizes her have all disappeared. So too have the inscriptions on the tombs and elsewhere which in the Latin are given with great preciseness. The story is somehow softened by moral padding and the omission of too sharp details; in particular, the plot is not worked out so carefully, and the loose ends are not gathered up with the almost mechanical neatness of the Latin original.

There is another great difference and again in the direction of vagueness and lack of sharp realistic detail. In the Latin all the characters, even the least important, have names; in the Greek poem the minor characters are left nameless as is usual in Greek folk literature. Apollonius and Antiochus, Archistratis and Tarsia, Athenagoras and Strongilos are still there in Greek dress; slightly altered, the father Archistrates appears as Archistratoras, and Dionysias as Dionida; the other characters are either anonymous or, like Hellanicus, are not mentioned at all.

Another modification to suit the new audience is interesting. In the Latin version Apollonius wins the favour of his future father-in-law by his skill as a masseur and as an attendant at the gymnasium. This to a sixteenth-century Greek audience would not have made much sense,

¹ Full information on all these works is in Krumbacher's *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur*. For the source of *Erotokritos* the reference is to *Poema cretană Erotokrit în literatura românească și izvorul ei necunoscut*, by N. Cartoian, Bucharest, 1935.

however much it may have fitted the Greek Hellenistic world. Therefore in the Venetian *rimada* Apollonius first distinguishes himself by his beautiful dancing and then by his skill in playing the harp. These romantic accomplishments commend themselves so much that at the request of the princess he is allowed to take up his quarters in the palace.

Of course the piece at the end of the Latin about the writing of the story by Apollonius himself and the two copies has disappeared. We have instead a moral epilogue about the duty of trusting in God and then the author names himself as Constantine, of Canea in Crete, dates his poem to the year 1500 and ends up with the couplet,

Καὶ ἂν ἔσφαλὰ καὶ τίποτες, ἃς ἔν' συμπαθημένο,
Γιατὶ ἔκαμνα τὶ κάτεχα καὶ τὰχα μαθημένο
['And if I have made any mistakes let it be pardoned;
for I wrote down what I knew and had learned.']

In examining the oral versions from Greece the Cretan ballad may be taken first: it is at least in the same literary form, written in the same political verse, as its Venetian original. It has been published twice with unimportant variants and lacunae in the short-lived Cretan periodical 'Ο Κρητικὸς Λαός. One version was recorded from a woman in the village of Phoúrphoura in the central Cretan province of Amári; for the other no locality is given, but we are told that it was sung by wedding processions when on the way from one village to another, and the distance was too great for the simple succession of couplets (ματινάδες) commonly used on such occasions. The names Apollonios, Archistrata and Tarsia or Tartsia are preserved, but Athenagoras appears as a prince (ρηγόπουλο), either nameless or with the new name of Rizimento (Ριζιμέντο). But the whole story has been recast and shortened to a tenth, the 1894 lines of the *rimada* reduced to 181 and 185; the story begins with the birth of the baby on board the ship, and everything is reduced to the merest outline except the incidents of the jealous foster-mother, the grief of Apollonios and his final joyous recognition of his daughter. The finding of the lost wife is reduced to a single couplet. I find only two lines in which any verbal resemblance to the original is preserved. The wicked foster-mother is telling Apollonios the false story of his daughter's death. Here the Venice *rimada* has the couplet:

Ἀπέθανεν ἡ Τάρσια, κ' ἔκαψε τὴν καρδιά μας,
Σὺν νῆχεν πέση τὸ κακὸ ἀπάνω 'ς τὰ παιδιά μας

where the anonymous Cretan version runs:

Ἡ Ταρσιὰ σου πόθανε, κ' ἔκαψε τὴν καρδιά μου,
Σὺν νῆχε πέση μιὰ φωτιά νὰ κάψῃ τὰ παιδιά μου.

And the Amári version is very much the same.

174 *Modern Greek Oral Versions of Apollonios of Tyre*

In general the whole poem has been recast on Greek folk-ballad lines. The story we have seen is cut down to what is really only one incident, the loss and regaining of the daughter, for a ballad can hardly contain more: this is a fundamental difference between a ballad and a narrative poem. The new opening and ending too are characteristic of the Greek ballad. The first couplet calls upon the audience to listen to the song:

Ἀφουκραστήτε νὰ σὰς πῶ τραγούδι τζ' Ἀρχιστράτας,
τὴν πῆρεν Ἀπολλώνιος κι ἐγέννησεν ὡς τὴ στράτα.

And the poem ends: 'Lo! the happy day when Apollonios found the mother and the daughter':

Ἔδε χαρὲς ποῦ γίνονται τῇ σημερινῇ ἡμέρα,
Ποῦ βρῆκεν Ἀπολλώνιος μάννα καὶ θυγατέρα.

Another notable influence of the Greek ballad is the occurrence of what is almost a ballad commonplace, the moaning tombstone.¹ When Apollonios goes to lament at the supposed tomb of his daughter, the tombstone uttered a moaning cry which was heard in the seven heavens, and what seemed the voice of an angel sounded in his ears telling him to go to Venice and that there he would find her:

Κι ἀπὸ τὴν τόση ταραχὴ ἡ πλάκα ἐβρουχίσθη,
Κι ἀπὸ τὴν τόση λύπησι ὡς τζ' ἔφτα οὐρανοὺς γροικίθη,
Κι ὡς ἂν ἀγγελικὴ φωνὴ ἤκουσεν ὅτι ἀφτί ντου
Νὰ πάη ἀπὸ τὴ Βενεθιά νὰ πάρῃ τὸ παιδί ντου

In the Latin version a contrary wind carries him to Mitylene where he finds her; in this Cretan version he is told to go to Venice; another typical modification in the Greek folk-lore direction, for to the Greek peasant Venice has been for centuries the centre of all Frankish wealth and power. In fact the ballad shows signs of having been orally current in Crete for a long time, reshaped by a series of singers not one of whom had ever seen the Venice *rimada*. This, too, is indicated by the vocabulary which has in one version quite a number of the Turkish words that have made their way into the common peasant language of Crete; examples are *καϊκι*, *μπέλκι*, *χάλι*, *βεκίλης*, *χαμπάρι*.

Of the two hitherto recorded prose versions the one from the island of Kýthera is the nearer to the *rimada*: set in the prose are four lines of verse, two of which are actually from the Venice text. Also, while in Greek folk-tales the characters are generally anonymous, we have here three names, Apollonios, Archistrata and Strongylios: the rest are lost. The story is truncated at the beginning, and the first episode is the sea journey of Apollonios and his wife, the birth of the baby and the seeming

¹ For an example see the Ballad of the Dead Brother in Politis's *Ἑκλογαί*, p. 138, line 68.

death of the mother, whose body was cast up at a monastery, where she lived as a nun.

Apollonios, having to go to a war, left his daughter with the vizier Strongylios, whose wife out of jealousy sent the girl off with a servant to be put to death. The man relented, and the girl after a meeting with some shepherds was carried off by pirates and sold into slavery. She resisted all attempts on her virtue, and the prince of the land fell in love with her: this is of course the Athenagoras of the Latin version and of the *rimada*. Apollonios was informed of the death of his daughter, and whilst he was mourning for her, his ship was carried to the place where she was in slavery: the name Mitylene is not given. The prince who is in love with the girl offered a reward to anyone who would rouse Apollonios from his silent grief; the girl went to divert him with her music, and in her song told the story of her life, mentioning the names of her father and of her mother and of Strongylios. So Apollonios recognized his daughter, and the prince of the land married her, and all three of them set off and came to the monastery. There they saw the coffin and on it was the name Archstrata. Apollonios met and recognized his wife, and then went and punished Strongylios and rewarded the servant who had saved his daughter's life. and so the story comes to its happy ending.

The following is the version from Aivali, printed in a German translation by Hahn.

There was once a prince who was unwilling to marry. (This is all that is left of the introductory episode of the prince running away to avoid a marriage with the princess incestuously loved by her father.) He went off in a ship to find a bride to suit his taste, but was shipwrecked; he landed and was helped by a kindly fisherman. Dressed in clothes given him by the fisherman and disguised by covering his head of hair with the stomach of an ox, he went to the king's palace, and found employment in the stables, where he was harshly treated by the groom. He went playing his flute, and the princess seeing him without his disguise fell in love with him. (This disguise as a scaldhead, here inserted into the story, is a commonplace of Greek folk-tales.)¹ Then he became a servant to the princess, who got her father's leave to take piano lessons from him. Three ambassadors came to ask the princess in marriage: the king sent her a letter by the hand of the prince, and she wrote in answer that she would marry no one but him. The king discovered the excellence of the youth and allowed the betrothal. Then a ship arrived with signs of mourning; she was searching for the lost prince; when the king found out that he was in fact a prince he celebrated the marriage. The ship brought back the news and the father went to greet his son and the bride. The father then died, and the prince started for his home to take up his inheritance. His wife went with him, and on board the ship gave birth to a daughter and then died. No mention is made of any storm. The body of the queen is put into a golden coffin with the usual letter and cast into the sea: no ship could sail with a dead body on board (another piece of familiar Greek folk-lore).² The coffin was washed ashore; a doctor brought the lady to life and built a monastery in which she could live as a nun.

The prince put the baby out to nurse with a friend of his father's, but the foster-parents grew jealous because she was so much more beautiful than their own daughter and she was sent out with a servant to be killed. The servant hesitated, and at that moment a pirate ship appeared and carried her away. The girl was sold to a bawd; with difficulty she preserved her chastity, and was at last allowed to make money for her mistress by playing music.

The prince on the death of his father inherited his crown. Then he received a letter from the foster-father, that his daughter had fallen sick and died. He fell into a melancholy, and voyaging in a ship he came to the town where his daughter was in servitude. She was sent for to play to him, and from her age and her riddling songs

¹ R. M. Dawkins, *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*, p. 222.

² R. M. Dawkins, *The Monks of Athos*, v. 91.

he recognized that she was his daughter, he tried to buy her from the old woman, who refused. Then the father threw the old woman into prison and went off with his daughter. He came to another town and there he saw a newly built monastery. In it he saw his wife's golden coffin, and so was led to recognize in the abbess his lost wife. The three of them went off to the wicked foster-father and punished him; then they went to the realm of the queen's father and rewarded the fisherman, and finally the prince inherited his wife's kingdom as well as his own.

This version having wandered as far as Asia Minor is further removed from the Venice *rimada* than the K  thera story. It has lost all the names of the characters, and in the episode of the disguise has borrowed from the common *corpus* of Greek folk-tales. Hahn recognized its derivation from a printed source, but Apollonios of Tyre did not occur to him: he discerned a very much less close parallel with what we know of Euripides' play *Alkmaion*.

Until recently these versions, the Cretan ballad and the two folk-tales, were the only evidence of the return of the Apollonios story to Greek soil. Now something quite fresh has turned up.

It happened that rather more than thirty years ago Dr W. H. D. Rouse was travelling in the Dodecanese, and in Kos he met a, by that time, rather elderly man called Jacob Zarraftis. A few years later I made the acquaintance of Zarraftis in Kos and Kalymnos. He was a sort of local antiquary, who picked up a living from some property of his own and by dealing in a small way in antiquities. There were several local scholars of this sort in the islands, and Zarraftis and the better-known Demosthenis Khaviaras of Symi were perhaps the best of them. Dr Rouse was much interested in the islands and in their lore and traditions, and he conceived the happy idea of setting Zarraftis to work to collect and write down whatever he could find in the islands of folk-ballads, folk-tales and similar material. The major part of these collections is from Kos, but Zarraftis had friends and connexions in other islands and sent in important material from Leros, Kalymnos and Astypalaia. All this material Dr Rouse has put into my hands. Among the folk-tales I found one much longer and much more a work of art than any other I had ever read. It occupies forty-eight closely written quarto pages in Zarraftis's exceptionally clear handwriting; the language is the dialect of the village of Asphendio   in Kos. Before I had read many pages I was aware that what I had in my hands was a new popular version of the story of Apollonios of Tyre. A comparative study of this piece with the other versions of the story, the Latin, the Venice *rimada*, the Cretan ballad and the folk-tales of K  thera and Aivali, suggested that a study of these wanderings of the story and of its adaptation to different tastes would be of some interest.

Though based on the Venice *rimada*, the Koan story has strayed further

from it than any of the other Greek versions; it has numerous interpolations and, what is of most interest, an entirely new handling of the final recognition scene. The names have been entirely recast; as thoroughly as they are in Shakespeare's *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*. Apollonios, Archistrata, and so on would not mean much to the villagers of Kos. Consequently we now find that the prince is called not Apollonios but Yannaki, Johnnie or Jack. The character who plays the part of Athenagoras is now called Nikolaki, Nicholas or Nickie, the wife is Angelica and her daughter Angelikoula. Many names of minor characters are omitted; the foster-mother and the negro servant are named, but only once, and that as a kind of afterthought in the final scene of the story: he is Abraham, and she Dikenio, the last stage of the Dionysias of the Latin and the Dionida of the Venice version. The whole story has been brought, one may say, from the castle to the village, but what it has lost in romantic character it has gained a thousand times in liveliness and vigour.

We shall find in the story not a few changes to fit the new milieu. At the very beginning quite a new turn is given to the incident of the incestuous father. Far from wishing to keep his daughter to himself, the wicked parent, whom all the audience would feel must be a victim to his consciousness of sin, is shown as most anxious to marry her off and so hush up the scandal: the riddle by which suitors are kept at a distance has therefore to be dropped. Apollonios, or as he is now called Jack, does, in fact, marry her, but when he has persuaded her to tell him the truth, he flees from her in horror. Later in the story, to clear the way for his marriage to Angelica, we are told of the first wife's death: in war Jack receives a letter from a dying soldier on the opposite side: this soldier reveals himself as his wife, here called Daphne. They bid one another farewell, and he gives her a burial as becomes a great princess. We are now in the Greek orthodox world of strict monogamy and of the laws of Christian marriage.

Jack went off in a ship laden with corn, and was carried to a town, left without a name; he relieved the famine and found the friend to whom he afterwards confided his daughter; at this later meeting the friend, the Strongylios of the earlier version, is called Anthony. Continuing his journey, Jack was shipwrecked; saved from the sea, he found his way by the help of a fisherman to the king's court, the father, here left nameless, of his future wife. But he is not the only man saved; with him was a young sailor called Nikolaki, young Nicholas, according to the regular rule in such stories that the hero should have a faithful friend, a *fidus Achates*, to accompany him in all his adventures. Nicholas plays in the

story the part of Athenagoras, the noble of Tarsus, who protects the girl and at the end of the story marries her.

The next incident is very much in the village style. In the Latin version, here no doubt following the Hellenistic Greek original, Apollonios makes himself useful to the king in the gymnasium. In the Venice *rimada* he is made a fine dancer and musician; at Aivali he is so far brought up to date as to teach the princess the piano; here he helps in the café, and by the favour of the princess is made coffee-maker to the king.

Jack and the princess of course fell in love, and when three successive envoys came asking her in marriage, she refused them all, and at last admitted her love for the supposed shepherd. The king, her father, was at first furious, but a ship arrived opportunely with the news that Jack was really a prince, and so he consented to the marriage. Presently news came that Jack must return to his kingdom, and his wife Angelica insisted on going with him. Then follows the birth at sea of the daughter, here called Angelikoula, Little Angelica, and the supposed death of the wife. Jack took the baby and gave her to his friend to bring up, and then went to his kingdom. His wars are related at some length, with two interpolated passages. There is an account of a stratagem whereby he obtained a victory: his soldiers gathered branches of trees and by hanging clothes on them made them seem like another army; the enemy thought they were surrounded and so gave up the fight. In another of these battles is placed the incident of his meeting with his first wife and of her death.

The story then returns to the fate of Angelikoula. The foster-mother grew jealous of her beauty, and sent her off with their negro servant to be put to death. Angelikoula of course besought the servant to spare her life; and this he did, bringing back the blood of a horse to make the wicked foster-mother—as easily deceived as such people always are in folk-tales—believe that he had carried out her orders. At this point pirates ought to come on the scene immediately, but the narrator inserts a long account of Angelikoula's adventures. She was rescued from a Great Snake by a negro, who took her to his tower to help his wife look after their baby. Three youths tried to ravish her, which seems a kind of repetition of the three suitors who, earlier in the story, had come for her mother, before she married the hero. She repulsed them, but in revenge they murdered the baby: the negro and his wife recognized her innocence, but found it too painful to keep her any longer in their tower. So she again set out on her adventures, and presently came to a town where a man was to be hanged for a trifling debt. With the money in her purse

she redeemed him, but the man had wanted to die and was angry at being saved. This is an incident which occurs in other Greek folk-tales. Like everyone else whom Angelikoula meets, he attempted her virtue. Again she escaped, and then we return to the usual thread of the story. She fell into the hands of pirates, who sold her as a slave: the name of the place, Mitylene, is omitted. Here too her virtue was proof against all temptations and trials, though her protector, the noble lord Athenagoras, is entirely omitted, his place in the story as her future husband being taken by her father's sailor friend Nicholas.

Her father then learned from the girl's foster-father that she was dead; he had no suspicion of the attempt to murder her, nor that she had in fact made her escape.

The scene is now set for the recognition by the hero of his supposedly dead wife and his lost daughter. In all the other versions this is arranged in two separate episodes: first, the prince at Mitylene recognizes his daughter in the beautiful musician sent to divert his melancholy; then they are carried to Ephesus and there the wife is found. The Asphendioú story-teller has here taken a line of his—or, I have some reason to suspect, her—own and rearranged the whole dénouement in a way that fits the suppression of the noble lord Athenagoras and the introduction as the daughter's future husband of the hero's sailor friend Nicholas, who is made the captain of the ship in which the hero sails. By making the mother the queen of the very town in which her daughter is living as a slave, he has arranged that both the recognitions should occur in the same place, one quickly succeeding to the other, giving a strong and exciting interest to the last quarter of an hour of his recital. In the use of coincidence he is no more naive than his classical predecessor.

In this recognition scene it is to be noted that of the four characters, the girl, her mother, the hero and his friend the captain, only the girl's identity is given to the audience, who are let into the secret step by step just as Jack himself is. Angelica, the lost mother and wife, is as yet known to the other characters only as the queen of the country; Jack is only a friend of the captain of the ship, whose name Nicholas is not used until the end of the scene. Reversing the usual order of events, the story-teller brings before us first the recognition by the queen of her husband and his friend, and then the recognition of all three of them by the girl. The narrator, by treating his characters as unknown and anonymous and making the whole scene centre round the girl, makes his hearers join in their astonishment and delight. As soon as the queen recognizes her husband and his friend the captain, we too recognize them, and in

recognizing them we see that the queen is the lost Angelica. After this we have only to see the daughter discovering her hitherto unseen and unknown father and mother.

The action is at Mitylene. One day a ship arrives with a captain and his friend, both left unnamed and presented as if they are new characters in the story: they are of course Jack and Nicholas. They are both taken to the house of the leno and there they see Angelikoula. The captain makes proposals for her favours, but he is so much struck by the charm of her virtue, that he determines to rescue her and to marry her honourably. After some farcical adventures in which the wretched leno comes off very badly, the girl makes her escape. The leno runs out after her, and at this point the captain and his friend, who have been intending to rescue her from her bondage, appear on the scene. The girl running down the street reaches the front of the palace of the queen of the country, who we are not yet allowed to know is the lost wife Angelica: the girl takes refuge in some sort of porch or portico. Here may be inserted a translation of the few last pages of the text, which will show how the final scene of recognition is arranged.

As soon as the girl set her foot on the threshold of the portico she cries out 'Help'. Over against the portico on the upper landing of the great stairway leading up to a crystal tower, there was standing by chance a woman dressed in black. It was the queen of the country. She heard the girl and at once commanded that she be brought before her. She was at once brought, and the queen says to her gently: 'What is the matter my daughter? why are you asking for help?' 'Many be your years, my lady: a wicked man is pursuing me, so I ran away to save my honour.' 'Where is he? who is it? Guards! seize the man at once who is pursuing the girl, and bring him here to me without more ado.' The queen beckoned to the girl to follow her, and went to her throne; she sat down and questioned the girl to learn clearly all about it. The girl began to relate how till then the leno had been persecuting her.

The royal guards took leave to go and arrest the man who had been pursuing the girl. So they went out to see who had been pursuing her, and they see a man and his companion coming up in haste; they ask them whither they are running; they answer that they are running after a girl who had gone into the portico. The guards said at once: 'One man she told us, but here are two', and they conducted them, both of them, before the queen. They were the captain and his friend who had been following the girl, but the guards were sure that they were the girl's enemies. For the girl had not turned at all to look behind her and see how the leno had been bundled off by the lads in the street, or to see who they were that were following her. She simply ran, and was sure that it was the leno himself running after her. The strangers understood the mistake made by the guards, but they obeyed their orders at once, because they wanted to find out what had happened to the girl that she was running away and had gone to that place to escape.

When they were about to come into the queen's presence the captain was in front and his friend was behind him. When the girl saw the captain facing her, she said to the queen: 'No, this is not the man.' But the queen looked at them carefully and then said: 'It is he.' The girl said again: 'No, my lady queen, it is not.' The queen again repeated: 'It is he, it is.' The girl again repeated with persistence: 'No, my lady queen—many be your years—it is not he. Indeed one of the two came yesterday evening and promised that he would come to-day to deliver me, and he may have come now to do this.' 'But then why were they running after you to catch you?' 'That they

know themselves.' Then the captain said: 'My lady queen, I felt sorry for this girl because she was in the hands of a rascal who intended to run her there in his house. I desired her virtue and her grace; I felt for her, and I landed to-day with my very good friend here to get her out of the hands of the pimp and to marry her.' The queen looked very closely at him, and then her eyes were seen to be full of tears; and she said: 'Good for you, worthy and noble man; admiral in the service of your king.' (The word 'king' lets the audience know that at this point the queen has recognized in Jack and Nicholas, her husband and his friend.) The captain answered: 'I thank you, and may your years be many, but I am no admiral, only a captain.' The queen answers: 'But now when he hears for himself of your noble conduct, he will make you his worthy admiral.' The captain's friend was surprised at what she was saying and did not know what to say. But as soon as he saw that she recognized that he was the captain's king, he was pleased with the compliment and said: 'A queen's command must be obeyed, so you are now indeed appointed my worthy admiral.' The captain made a courtly bow, kissed the hand of his king and said: 'I thank you, and many be your years.' Then says the queen to the girl: 'I can have no doubt that you will approve the admiral's noble proposal. And so from now onwards I make you queen of this country and your king is Admiral Nicholas.' (By the use of the name Nicholas we are again told that the queen has by now recognized her husband and his friend.)

The girl was bursting with delight and looked very hard at the queen to see if anything was the matter with her. The admiral and his friend the king looked at her much puzzled and said to themselves: 'She speaks like a prophetess.' But they did not quite understand what she meant. The queen rose up and said to them: 'I, O admiral in the service of your king, have now made you king of this country of mine here, and your bride is the queen; but what present will you give me?' 'What shall I give you?' 'And ought not I to have . . . something royal?' The girl was sharp and understood the meaning of her question; she rose up and said to her: 'Yes, you too ought to have a king.' The queen was delighted, and said to her: 'Good for you, my young lady queen, and good for you again.' The admiral's king said in bewilderment: 'I don't understand a little bit; what is this comedy we are playing here?' The queen then answers: 'My generosity in giving ought to be rewarded: I give away a royal realm: I ought to be given a king in return.' 'I don't understand what you are saying.' 'Have you not a wife?' 'Surely; she died twelve years ago.' 'But you still need a wife?' 'Her unforgettable memory stands in my way.' 'Was she so fair, and did you love her so much?' 'Do not, I pray you, gall an old wound.' 'Here in my country twelve years ago the sea cast up a chest and in it was the body of a queen.' 'Ah, perhaps it was my beloved.' 'In the chest with her were two pillow-cases full of coin and a letter too with her name in it.' 'Yes; it was Angelica.' 'The letter said too that one bag of money should belong to whomever found her, and the other to the monastery of the place.' 'Oh, it was she, my wife now in heaven. She died in childbirth in my ship in a dreadful storm. But I beg you; where is she buried that I may go and say a prayer at her tomb? Oh, my Angelica!' As he spoke the tears ran from his eyes. Then she says to him: 'Alas! it is twelve years ago; who can remember and show you her tomb? Pardon her, my friend, and turn your lamentation to joy. See; I too am called Angelica.' 'Take me to her tomb.' 'Here I was a queen; I have given away my kingdom; let me be again, as it is right I should be, the queen of my dear Jack.' 'But why, tell me, will you not show me her tomb, that I may go and water it with the tears from my eyes, which she used to kiss so sweetly when she lived?' 'Well, come then, and I will show it to you.' And suddenly she opens a door just close by and points with her hand to something inside, and says to him: 'Do you recognize it?' 'Oh, it is the chest into which I put her; why have they taken her out of it?' 'Because she came back to life.' 'She came back to life?' 'Yes.' 'How did she come back to life?'

'They had had her in her chest in the monastery. A man kept watch the first night. There in the morning she came to life; she got up and ran away from the monastery and looked for some other place in which to hide. By chance she came to the royal apartments; she curled herself up in one of them till it was full daylight. As she was lying there curled up, two lords of the land appear and tell her kindly to go into the palace. They offered her various royal possets, and she came to herself. Next come

some women of high rank, and put royal robes on her. Then come the twelve peers with a royal crown and say to her: "Yesterday we made a resolution that, since our king and our queen have perished in war and had no heir, whomsoever we found in the morning in the rooms below the palace, we would make him our king. Now since we have found you, it is your fortune to be made our queen." And so they put the royal crown on her head and she became the queen of this country. And now she has given her kingdom to this man who was with you thirteen years ago when your Angelica had the good fortune to be married to you. And now are you still puzzled? and don't you know me, my dearest Jack?'

(This making a king of some stranger who happens to appear is found often in Greek folk-tales; it is just another example of how this version is immersed in the general world of folk-tale motives.)

Nicholas cried out in amazement, 'What: it is Queen Angelica, his wife.' And she threw herself on Jack's neck and kissed him. Jack lifted up his hands and blessed God, and said: 'Glory be to Thee O God, and marvellous are thy works.' Then tears of joy ran down his face and he explained everything to her. What joy they had!

(That Jack is the last to see what was obvious at once to his wife, guessed at by his daughter, and finally plain even to Nicholas, is a device for dramatic effect; also the cleverness of the women as opposed to the slowness of the men would please the cynicism of a Greek peasant audience.)

When they were a little quieter, Queen Angelica asks Jack: 'And what happened to the child I bore?' 'Oh, the poor little thing. After that unimaginable sorrow the wind carried us to the country of a friend of mine, a king. He came to condole with me in my ship. He saw the baby lying there, and asked me to leave it with his wife, who had herself at that time borne a little girl, that she should rear them together as twin sisters. I thought to myself that I should have great hindrances and difficulties in bringing up the child; I saw his deep friendly zeal and that of his wife; and I made up my mind and left them the baby. Then I went to my kingdom. But from the day I went there and for eleven years wars never ceased. Until last year too I used to get a letter from my friend to tell me that my child was well and getting on with her reading and growing to great beauty and charm.' Angelica then sighed and said: 'Oh my child! and then what happened?' 'Then some while ago I went to see her, and to take her away with me, and I found her dead.' Angelica then trembled and cried out with the anguish of a mother: 'Oh, my poor child!' 'Yes, indeed; Heaven, I thought, had struck me, and I cried out with inconsolable tears: "My dear Antony, where is the tomb of my Angelikoula?" A black servant of theirs then turned and saw me with tears in my eyes and was sorry for me.'

(This is of course the servant who had been charged to kill the girl. At this point Angelikoula perceives the situation. In the original version she had heard the story of her birth and childhood from the nurse Lycoris, left with her by her father when he put her with her foster-parents, but as the nurse has dropped out, the revelation has to be brought about by her hearing her own name and that of her foster-father and the mention of the black servant. The text goes on:)

Then Angelikoula broke out like the shot of a gun, and says: 'Did you see your daughter's tomb?' 'Yes.' 'And was your daughter called Angelikoula?' 'He

mother was called Angelica, and so when we lit the candles and baptized her there in the ship, I called her Angelikoula.' 'And what was the name of the wife of your friend King Antony?' 'Dikemó.' 'And of her negro servant?' 'Abraham.'

Then Angelikoula ran to them as though mad with joy, and cried out: 'My mother! My father! Glory be to Thee, O God, I have found my parents.' And she was kissing now her mother and now her father and could never have enough. Jack, Angelica and Nicholas were staring at her, beside themselves, as though they had lost their senses. Her mother and her father took her in their arms, but they still had some doubts. Then Angelikoula begins and from the beginning to the end tells them all her tribulations. When they had believed her, then Angelica said: 'So it was quite right of me to make my gift to your sweetheart Nicholas, and to make you queen as a gift from me your mother. I recognized your father and his dear friend Nicholas as well, the young sailor who was with him when the ship was wrecked; I saw and understood his noble conduct and honoured him as was fitting with a royal reward.'

Then Nicholas said, kissing the hand of Angelica: 'I thank you much for rewarding me with your royal gift, and I give glory to God Almighty who has enlightened me to honour virtue and to love his noble creatures, like your daughter Angelikoula.' Then said Angelikoula to Nicholas: 'Endless and countless thanks I owe you, who have both saved me and brought me to my mother and to my father.' Then says Jack: 'Glory be to God, who sent me so many trials and has set me up in such good fortune. And you, my friend, you saved my daughter and I thank you. In this too I may boast that you are fitly rewarded by my daughter Angelikoula and by this kingdom.' And at once Queen Angelica sent out heralds to make proclamation that men should come, small and great, to the high wedding of her daughter. And so they held the wedding, and then Jack took his Angelica, and they go off and punish the merciless and jealous foster-mother, and then they came to Kos and lived happily.

The mass of material from Kos and two other of the Dodecanesian Islands, Astypalaia and Leros, sent by Zarraftis to Dr Rouse is very considerable, and both the folk-tales and the ballads show signs of having been rehandled locally by men of far greater skill than the usual run of Greek tellers of folk-tales and singers of ballads. The freshness of the folk-tales and especially the liveliness of the dialogue make it plain that the stories were not gathered from people who knew them by heart, word for word, but were composing on a traditional theme and even modifying it considerably. So far it is clear that the narrators were not children as they so often were in Asia Minor, for children repeat word for word often to the extent of making nonsense through failure of memory: these Dodecanesians were clearly in their way original artists. It is all the more a pity that Zarraftis never reports anything of his informants: were they men or women? Were they old or young? Had they travelled abroad or not? What was their social position in the village? On all these points he maintains a complete silence. But, however the story was handled by his predecessors, this last teller of the story of Apollonios shows that he had the same power of adapting the theme to the surrounding atmosphere as the composer of the Venice *rimada*, and with it an abundant capacity to make the best of all his materials; for the interpolated pieces from Greek folk-tales, though not essential to the story, are not without their own interest; in particular the incident of the negroes

in the tower and their grief for their child attains a real pathos. It is curious to find the old Greek novel, after its long sojourn in Europe, returning as it were by accident to the country of its origin, having taken, like a chameleon, fresh tints and colours at every move, while all through preserving faithfully the central thread of the narrative.

R. M. DAWKINS.

OXFORD.

THE OLDEST STUDY OF GERMANIC PROPER NAMES

As early as 1537 an attempt was made to elucidate the etymologies of Germanic proper names in a little Latin book published anonymously at Wittenberg. It is a small quarto volume of 28 leaves. The title, printed within a handsome woodcut border, is: *Alquot Nomina Propria Germanorum ad Priscam Etymologiam restituta. Per quendam antiquitatis Studiosum*. On the verso of the title-page are these lines: 'Lectoribus S. Exemplum dedi vobis, ut plura et meliora faciatis. Valete', and the colophon reads: 'Impressum Witembergæ per Nicolaum Schirlentz, 1537.' A cheaper edition in octavo size and with the colophon 'Witembergæ, ex Officina Typographica Nicolai Schirlentz', followed in 1544. In 1559, when Luther had been dead for thirteen years and Nicolaus Schirlentz, no doubt, had also died, there appeared at Ursel¹ a pirated reprint with Luther's name on the title-page, and this was followed in 1570 by a Wittenberg edition, 'autore reverendo D. Martino Luthero'. Schirlentz is certain to have known the name of the author,² but we cannot be sure that his successors in the firm did, and they may simply have adopted the method of their piratical colleagues in order to increase their sales of the book. The treatise was reprinted with the title *De nominibus propriis Germanorum eorumque pristinam etymologiam reducendorum ratione opusculum per quendam antiquitatis studiosum compositum* in Simon Schardii *Scriptores rerum Germanicarum*, vol. i, pp. 816 ff., Basle, 1574³ and there were further separate issues: Augustæ Rheticiæ⁴ (undated and anonymous), Witembergæ, 1611 and Helmstadii,⁵ 1673 (both with Luther's name).⁶

The treatise was not included in the first edition of Luther's collected works, Wittenberg, 1539-61, nor in the Jena edition, 1556-8, but was printed in vol. ix, pp. 1952 ff. of the Altenburg edition, 1661-4, also (with Luther's name) in Christian Becmann's *Manuductio ad Latinam Linguam*, Wittenberg, 1611, and was appended to David Büttner's *Turca religiosus*,

¹ Ursel, a small town, not far from Wiesbaden

² Schirlentz printed more than twenty of Luther's pamphlets from 1522 to 1542. Cf. Arnold Kuczyński, *Verzeichnis von Flugschriften Luthers*, Leipzig, 1870.

³ Simon Schard, 1535-73, noted jurist and historian.

⁴ Augustæ Rheticiæ, i.e. Augsburg.

⁵ Helmstedt, in the former duchy of Brunswick, was from 1574 to 1809 the seat of a Protestant university.

⁶ Copies of nearly all these editions are in the British Museum. The Bodleian has a copy of the Augustæ Rheticiæ edition and the Taylorian (Oxford) a copy of the Wittenberg edition, 1544.

Zwickau, 1664, 'allen Liebhabern der recht deutschen Philologie zum Besten', with the title *Des sel. Herrn D. Martini Lutheri Tractatlein de nominibus propriis Germanorum, wie solches in der Kirchenbibliothek zu Lichtenstein vorhanden*. A German translation appeared at Leipzig in 1674 entitled, *Herrn D. Luthers Seel. vielfaltig verlangtes Nahmenbuchlein, welches erstmal ohne seinen Nahmen zu Wittenberg An. 1537 (nunmehr schon vor 137 Jahren), nachmals mit und unter seinem Nahmen 1570 auch zu Wittenberg im Latein ausgegangen, jetzo der edlen deutschen Hauptsprache aufrichtigen Liebhabern, die der alten Deutschen Nahmen Deut- und Auslegung zu wissen begehren, zu Gefallen deutsch herausgegeben von M. Gottfried Wegener*.¹

In the following passage, on leaf 36 of his *Mithridates* printed in 1555, Konrad von Gesner² referred to the treatise as a work of Luther's, published anonymously: 'Omnia haec nomina propria ad Germanicam sermonem pertinere . . . Multas jam annotavit Mart. Lutherus in libello de nominibus propriis Germanice edito, dissimulato nomine suo.'

The interest in the little book and the belief in Luther's authorship continued unabated throughout the eighteenth century. It was ascribed to Luther in Vincenti Placeli's *Theatrum Anonymorum et Pseudonymorum*, Hamburg, 1708, and in F. J. Beyschlag's *Sylloge variorum opusculorum*, Hallae Suevorum,³ 1729, vol. 1, pp. 455 ff., whereas J. G. Eccard, in his *Historia Studii etymologi linguae Germanicae*, Hanover, 1711, questioned Luther's authorship. For this he was promptly taken to task by Egenolff⁴ in Chapter VI of his *Historie der Teutschen Sprache, Anderer Theil*, Leipzig, 1720, where he writes:

In diesem Cap. sind wir gesonnen von den Zunahmen der Menschen, Lander, Flusse u.d. zu handeln, die aus der Teutschen Sprache konnen erkläret werden. Philippus Cluverius hat in Erweisung seines Satzes, dass alle erste Einwohner von Europa anfangs Teutsch geredet, viel dergleichen zusammen gesucht. Was aber dissfalls von

¹ 'The late Doctor Luther's little book of names, which has been in great demand, first published in Latin without his name at Wittenberg in 1537 (as long as 137 years ago) and later with and under his name in 1570 likewise at Wittenberg, is now translated into German by M. Gottfried Wegener for the benefit of true lovers of the noble German language who desire to know the meaning and interpretation of the old Germanic proper names.'

² Konrad von Gesner or Conrad Gesnerus (1516-65), Swiss polyhistor, called by Cuvier 'the German Pliny', author of many important works including *Mithridates de differentiis linguarum*, Zürich, 1555, an account of about 130 languages known to him, with the Lord's prayer in twenty-two tongues. (Mithridates or Mithradates, king of Pontos, 132-63 B.C., was credited with having spoken the languages of the twenty-two countries he had conquered.)

³ Hallae Suevorum, Schwäbisch Hall in Württemberg.

⁴ J. A. Egenolff, 1683-1729, 'collega tertius' at the protestant Furstenschule at Grimma, author of *Historie der Teutschen Sprache*, Leipzig, 1716-20. His *Responsio ad libellum Wakei*, Lipsiae, 1717, was directed against J. K. Wake, Professor of Theology at a Roman Catholic college at Regensburg, who had maintained that the German language was closely related to Celtic and Chaldean and that the Bavarian dialect was derived from Syriac.

den Wortern überhaupt wahr ist, das ereignet sich sonderlich in den Zunahmen der Menschen (in nominibus hominum proprius), in Benennung der Flusse, Lander, Geburge und dergleichen, daher ist des seel. D. Luthers Fleiss zu loben, welcher selbst in seiner Jugend ein Buchlein von den Teutschen Zunahmen geschrieben und dadurch mit seinem Beyspiel alle wiederlegt, welche glauben, dass die Alterthumer der Teutschen Sprache zu untersuchen ein unnutzer Zeit-Verderb sey, weil man doch in dieser ungeheuren Finsternuss nichts gewisses erkennen konte. Es haben sich zwar einige gefunden, welche laugnen wollen, dass Lutherus Verfasser von besagtem Buche sey, woran auch selbst der in diesen Dingen wohlerfahrene Herr Eccard zu zweifeln (am 43. Blatt der *Stud. Et. Germ*) scheinet. Aber wenn ich mir hier die Zeit nehmen wolte, so konte ich gar leichte erweisen. dass dieses Buchlein allerdings aus keiner andern, als des sel. D. Luthers Feder geflossen.

A puzzling piece of evidence brought forward in support of Luther's authorship is a letter of Erasmus printed by Egenolff on pp. 104 ff. of his edition of V. E. Loescheri's *Literator Celta seu De excolenda literatura Europaea occidentali et septentrionali Consilium et Conatus*, Lipsiae, 1726. In this letter, addressed from Freiburg im Breisgau to J. Pflug,¹ 'Clarissimo Viro, D.D., Serenissimi Georgii Ducis a Consiliis', Erasmus thanks his friend ('optissime Juh') for having sent him a copy of Luther's treatise: 'Martini Lutheri vestri quod addis de Nominibus propriis Germanorum perplacet opusculum. Reddam vicem, ut ait ille, meritis.'² This passage, if genuine, would go far to prove Luther's authorship of the treatise. It is, however, missing in the letter as printed by Erasmus himself and in all subsequent editions. Moreover, the date of Erasmus's letter, x Calend. Septemb. cio io xxxii, i.e., 23 August 1532, is five years earlier than the first known edition of the treatise. Egenolff says in his preface that he owed the letter to Jo. Elias Heder, who possessed the original in Erasmus's autograph.³ I have it on the authority of Mrs P. S. Allen and Dr H. W. Garrod that this date is undoubted, as the letter was printed by Erasmus himself in his *De praeparatione ad mortem* which appeared early in 1534 and the answering letter from Pflug exists at Gotha, dated 4 January 1533. It is not impossible that there was an earlier edition of the treatise of which no copies are extant, or anyhow recorded, and that Erasmus when printing his letter omitted the passage either because he considered it of no importance or for some private reason connected with his changed attitude to Luther. It is also conceivable that Egenolff interpolated it without noticing the discrepancy of dates.

With the rapid rise of philological scholarship in the nineteenth century

¹ Julius Pflug (or Pflugk), 1499-1564, Roman Catholic divine, from 1541 Bishop of Naumburg.

² I.e. *Amores*, I, 6, 23). 'redde vicem meritis.'

³ The letter has been printed in the tenth volume of *Opus Epistolarum Des Erasmi Roterdami*, denuo recognitum et auctum per H. M. Allen et H. W. Garrod. Oxford University Press, 1941. See also the note *ibid.* pp. xxiii and xxiv.

the treatise lost its appeal and was all but forgotten. E. K. Reichard discussed it in his *Versuch einer Historie der deutschen Sprachkunst*, Hamburg, 1747. A. Kinderling contributed to number 13 of the *Neuer literarischer Anzeiger*. München. 1806, an article on 'Luthers Buch von den Eigennahmen der Deutschen', and K. H. Jördens gave a useful account of it (ascribing it to Luther) in vol. VI of his *Lexikon deutscher Dichter und Prosaisten*, Leipzig, 1806. It was not included in the Erlangen edition of Luther's works (LXVII vols.), 1820-57, nor has it been printed so far in the great Weimar edition, 1883—(in progress). Karl von Bahder, in his *Deutsche Philologie im Grundriss*, Paderborn, 1883, put it, with Luther's name in brackets, at the head of a chronological list of works dealing with the etymology of Germanic proper names. Rudolf von Raumer, in his *Geschichte der Germanischen Philologie*, München, 1870, contents himself with a deprecating reference to it in a footnote (p. 32), leaving the question of authorship open: 'Ob Luther wirklich der Verfasser sei, ist streitig'; and one looks in vain for any mention of it in Hermann Paul's *Geschichte der deutschen Philologie* (*Pauls Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie*, vol. I, pp. 9-158), Strassburg, 1901.

The author, whoever he may have been, deserves a modest place in the history of German etymological studies, though it would be going too far to call him their father. As far as we know, he was the first to write a whole treatise on the subject, but there are many sporadic attempts at Germanic etymologies in the works of German writers long before his time.¹

Here are a few specimens of both his best and his worst efforts. They will suffice to give a fair idea of his philological acumen and of the state of etymological studies in his days. I have corrected obvious misprints, have resolved all contractions and normalized the punctuation.

¶ Nomina propria habentia -olf seu -ulf sunt vere Germanica, ut:—

RODOLFUS a Latinis corruptum est sed Germanice dicitur Rathulf, id

¹ The earliest on record are Notker Labeo's (950-1022) derivations of O.H.G. *niowihht*, *neht* and *binuz*, *binez* (mod. Germ. *Bunse*, O.E. *beonet*, Engl. *benet*, 'reed growing in wet places').—'Sumelche chednt substantiam *ēht*, quod intellegitur *ieht*. i. aliquid, accidens mit *ēhte*. Videtur autem esse compositum *ieht* et ejus negatio *neht*, quod integre dicitur *ein ēht* und *neheirn ēht*. Sicut et corrupte dicitur *iowihht* et ejus negatio *niowihht*. De omni namque re *wiht* dicitur. Interrogamus enim dicentes *ist tār iowihht?* quasi diceremus *ist tār einwihht*. i. aliquid. Respondemus quoque *niowihht*. i. *neheirn wiht*. Unum ergo significant *iowihht* unde *ieht*, et item *niowihht* unde *neht*. De homine quoque dicitur *ubihwihht*, *pōsewihht*. Ergo *wiht*, *ēht*, *ieht*, 'wist', daz ist substantiam, significant.' (Chapter 32, Explicit de Substantia, of Notker's translation of Boethius' Latin version of Aristotle's *Categories*. Piper's edition I, 397.)—'Der *binez* pezeichnenet immortalitatem, wanda er is gruone ist fone der nazi, an dero er stāt unde dannan er namen habet.' (Notker's commentary on Marcellianus Capella's *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*. Piper I, 787.) No satisfactory etymology has yet been suggested; connexion with O.H.G. *nazza* and its diminutive *nezzila*, mod. Germ. *Nessel*, O.E. *netele*, Eng. *nettle* has been thought of.

est consilium et auxilium, salus enim seu auxilium dicitur *hulf*, rat consilium.

LODOLFUS corrupte, Germanice dicitur Luidhulf seu Leudhulf: lude u Hollandico vel leud Suevica diphthongo significat homines in plurali. Est igitur Leudhulf Græce Alexander.

LANDOLFUS pro Landhulf, id est terrarum salus seu regionis auxiliator.

ARNULFUS pro Ernulf: honoris auxilium qui juvet et promoveat honestatem et virtutem, perpetuo enim Latini a scribunt et pronunciant ubi Germani e seu diphthongum æ habent.

ULFARUS, id est *hulfer* seu *helfer*: salvator, auxiliator—Alexius. Josua, Jesus, Esdras etcetera.

MINULFUS absque dubio meum auxilium seu salus mea, *myn* enim Saxonice meum significat, inde Mynhulf.

AISTULPHUS est Hasthulf, festinum auxilium. *ḡaft* Saxonica festinum, acrem, ardentem significat.

AGLULFUS, qui est vel Eilhulf, id est citum velox auxilium (idem fere quod Hasthulf), *ĕil* enim significat festinationem, celeritatem, vel quod hodie exstat in usu Ertelhulf. plenum et merum auxilium.

¶ Nec mirum est linguam ab imperitis depravari, nam nos vicissim regnante barbarie Latinam linguam egregie corrupimus. Eadem ignorantia credo corruptum esse ipsum capitale nomen nationis nostrae, scilicet Germania. Verisimile est enim latinos historicos falsos esse in litera H et eam pro G inspexisse et legisse vel etiam auditu non satis discrevisse, cum fortis aspiratio H propinquae sonet literae G. Igitur Hermaniam puto nostram nationem olim dictam. Sicut et ille præstantissimus dux, qui Augusti legiones cecidit, perperam Arminius ab Italīs dicitur, cum sit re vera Herman, adhuc hodie vulgatissimum nomen. Est autem Herman vir exercitus seu dux belli, *h̄eer* enim exercitus seu bellum est, unde dicitur *h̄eerfart*, id est expeditio bellica, inde Hermani, Hermannia, id est Bellicosi, Bellicosa.

Et aliis cogitandum relinquo, num et illud vocabulum Alemani sit corruptum pro Adelman Adelmania sicut ego suspicor.

¶ Omnia nomina in -*riđ* sunt Germanica, ut:—

FRIDERICH: Pacificus—Salomo, Irenæus. Est autem *riđ* seu *riđ* Suevice *reid̄* dives; sic dicitur flumen piscosum *fiđ̄reid̄*, terra fertilis *for̄nreid̄*, pecuniosus *gelbreid̄*.

ALARICUS rex Longobardorum, quem nunc Olrich seu Ulrich dicimus, sed verius Allrich, id est omnibus abundans: Pantoplusios.

EMERICH, id est Imerrich: semper dives, nunquam deficiens.

HINRICH, hunc Julius Cæsar vocat Vercingetorix, sed scriptorum vitio

confusis transpositis et corruptis literis. Voluit nomen Saxonium illud, Hertoge Hinric, scribere, id est dux Henricus. Et postea scriptores mutarunt H in V et transpostuerunt toge post Hin et geto fecerunt, sed vox hodie celeberrima satis convincit codicum mendas. Saxoniae nomen dicitur Hertoge Hinric, Suevice Hertzog Heinrich; hertog seu herzog est idem quod dux, ab heer, id est exercitus et zog a zihen, id est ducere seu proficisci in bellum. Significat autem Hinric id quod intus seu domi dives, seu familiarum dives, multorum pater et gubernator.

DIETRICH, Graece Theoderichus dicitur, a Deud seu Dūð, quo nomine dicuntur Germani Deum nominasse, et historici per T scribunt Teut; verum ipsa pronuntiatio adhuc durans testatur Deud esse seu Dud dicendum licet, et ipse Cæsar semper T scribat ubi D pronunciatum audivit ex ore Germanorum. Ab hoc Deud dicimur nos Germani Deudīð sed Saxonica dialecto Dūðīð (y Pythagorico seu u Belgico); nam in talibus omnibus vocabulis spectanda est dialectos Saxonica, qua olim tota Germania est usa. Ita Germani a Deo suo nomen sumpserunt, quem Deud seu Dud appellavere, quemadmodum posterius eorum se Gottos dixerunt a Got, id est Deo, quem Gut vocant etiam hodie illi ipsi Goti, nempe Dani, Sædi etc., sed tota Germania Got, nam Goti fuerunt Germani; sed quia tam Got quam Gut accentu circumflexo pronuntiatur, factum est ut eosdem et Gætas (per diphthongon) historici appellent. Gut vero significat bonus, bonum.

Hinc est ille Didrich seu Dudrich: dives in Deo, divus, divinus—Graece Eusebius; Pius.

¶ Omnia nomina in -walt sunt Germanica, ut:—

OSWALT, rectius Huswalt: gubernator domus, praefectus oeconomus, qui nunc in aula hofemeister; walt enim significat potestatem, magistratum vel gubernandi facultatem. Inde vox auspantium aliquod: des walt Gott, Deus gubernet hoc.

EHEWALT, syncopatum Ewalt sed dicendum Hægewalt, qui potestatem vel officium custodiendi et servandi habet; hegen enim significat custodire. Inde nomen heger; servator, custos, in aula fernerer, rentmeister. Sic agrum, pratum lignatum sepibus circumscriptum vocatur gehegt, scilicet quod ab usu publico separatum custoditum est. Et consistorium, tribunal seu sacer circulus (ut Homerus loquitur) vocatur gehegebanf, gehegt gericht.

¶ Omnia nomina in -old sunt Germanica, ut:—

ARNOLDUS, Germanice Ernholt: honestus amans honestatis et virtutis. Sic hodie Cæsaris caduceator vocatur herold id est ernholt qui virtutem et honestatem quaerat et servet.

LEUPOLD, hoc proprie dici debet Liebhold, nomine composito quasi dicas lieb und hold: amabilis et dilectus—Erasmus, Amandus; lieb enim est amatus vel amabilis, hold est gratia, qua diligo, inde dicitur holder bule, id est: chara sponsa vel amica. Er ist mir nicht hold, id est: non diligit me.

DIEPOLT ego puto idem esse quod Liebold, et lambdakismo aliquo viciatum nomen, quia omnes qui laborant labdakismo¹ pronunciant in syllabae initio d.

¶ Omnia nomina in -man sunt Germanica, ut:—

HERRMAN quem Itali Arminium corrupte dicunt, scilicet dux exercitus, bellator.

HARTMAN: vir fortis—Andreas, hart enim durum, fortem, invictum significat; passive qui non cedit sed perdurat.

Est autem man componibile nomen tam frequens in Germanica lingua quam est *ullus* in Græco et Latino; sic dicunt Hausman, Theman, Dorfman.

¶ Nomina in -hart sunt Germanica, hart significat robur, fest, stard, ut:—VOLKHART: robur, columen, sustentator populi—Demosthenes.

LEENHART: robur leoninum; viriliter agens et impavide.

BERNHART: robur ursi.

EHRHART: robur honoris seu honestum robur; qui viriliter honesta tuetur.

DEGENHART: robur virtutis, scilicet qui constans et firmus est in virtute nec plectitur nec corrumpitur. Degen enim est a dügen, valere, validum esse, ut Saxonice dicitur: Er het my alle ehre und dügent, id est: omni genere virtutis et officiorum me affecit.

REINHART forte Rugenhart: pacis robur.

GOTTHART: robur Dei—Gabriel. Sort, substantive dicitur ab hart adjectivo, firmitas. Sic Deum appellamus unser Sort.

Reliqua quædam

CAROLUS seu KAROLUS haud dubie est illud Saxonicum ferle per e diphthongum quam illi semper faciunt a Italicum. Est autem ferle vir procere staturæ et grandis corporis, qualem fuisse Carolum primum scribunt.

MARABODUS, sic Latini sed Germani Mehrerod, per syncopen Mehrnod (circumflexo accentu); licet crassilingues Germaniæ superioris depravant od in vogt. Est autem mehr major, od vero venit a vöden

¹ *labdakismus* (δ λαμβδακισμός), here: inability to pronounce l, substitution of other sound for l.

quod est fovere, alere, enutrire sicut parentes alunt liberos et animalia suos foetus. Igitur Marobodus est der *Meherbod*, id est alumnus major, superior, eminentior, qui reliquis vodis inferioribus præest. Hinc et alia regio dicitur Vodland nunc corrupte Voitland seu Vogtland, quia ea fuerit forte provincia per unum Vodum administranda.

MARSCHALCUS. Nullum nomen fœdus est corruptum per Italos vel scriptorculos. Est enim *Mehrer* seu major et *Stallherr*, qui est magister equitum ab æquitatibus gubernandis, et dicendum ac scribendum fuit *Mehrſtallherr*, id est major, superior, summus magister equitum, qui est hodie titulus Ducis Electoris Saxoniae. Ac si non fusset vox ea corrupta, non esset opus nunc addere *Archi-*, *Ertzmarschalek*, sed *Mehrſtallherr* dedisset id quod *ertz-* vel *archi-*, cum significet summum magistrum equitum.

LOTHARIUS est *Luther*, frequens adhuc hodie nomen in Germania, præsertim in Saxonia; significat autem herum seu dominatorem hominum. *Lüde* enim Saxonice homines significat, *Herr*: herum seu dominatorem; denique Saxones usque in hanc diem vocant Lotharium, optimum imperatorem, Keiser Ludher — Hinc Lotharingia, Ludheringen, id est Ludheri mansio, a nepote Caroli magni; nunc dicunt Lottringen crassissime.

ROSEMUNDA: Rosemund, os roseum. Hoc non habet dubium.

H. G. FIEDLER.

OXFORD.

THE EARTH SPIRIT IN 'FAUST'

THE minds of *Faust* commentators¹ have always been exercised by the fact that the 'Erdgeist', invoked by Faust in the first scene of the play, seems in two later scenes² to be regarded as the agent responsible for the appearance of Mephisto, while in the 'Prologue in Heaven' Mephisto deals directly with the Lord. With regard to this problem the commentators may be said to fall into two main groups: those who take the 'Erdgeist' scene to have determining force even in the motivation of the final version, and those who do not. The latter, who are the more numerous, explicitly or implicitly assume that the scene was retained primarily for its poetic quality, with the secondary function of driving Faust to despair and thus making him more amenable to Mephisto.

Among the commentators of the first group Korff³ declares that Faust, by summoning the Spirit of the Earth, having lost his old God, finds a new God and thereafter enters upon the wager with Mephisto 'im Vertrauen auf den neuen Gott seines Innern, dessen Bild er im Erdgeist beschworen'. He further assumes that Faust, when he entrusts his fate to the Spirit of the Earth, 'diesem guttesschaffenden Bösen', dimly divines the non-existence of evil as such. The Earth Spirit thus becomes 'das Symbol des Faustischen Gottes, des Allumfassers, Allerhalters', and the scene 'die zentrale Manifestation der Faustischen Religiosität', whereby the future salvation of Faust's soul is guaranteed. This view seems to me incompatible with Faust's aggrieved ejaculation: 'Und nicht einmal dir!' (I. 517).⁴ As indicated by the quotation above, Korff—and Rickert after him⁵—denies objective reality to the 'Erdgeist'; he is to them merely the outward symbol of Faust's wish phantasy and pales sadly in the devitalizing medium of 'Geisteswissenschaft'.

Kühnemann⁶ regards the Erdgeist scene as 'ein Drama im Drama von schauerlicher Grösse', the peculiar tragedy of genius forced to recognize that man can never be God. For this critic, therefore, the 'Erdgeist',

¹ Only a certain number of works have under present circumstances been accessible to me. Those specially referred to will be quoted below.

² The monologue superscribed 'Wald und Hölle', written in Italy and inserted in the 'Fragment' of 1790—an outburst of deep gratitude—and the abusive prose dialogue with Mephisto after Faust has learned Gretchen's fate, without doubt one of the earliest scenes written.

³ H. A. Korff, *Geist der Goethezeit*, I, Leipzig, 1913, pp. 294 f.

⁴ I note that in Korff's later work (*Faustischer Glaube*, Leipzig, 1938) the scene is barely mentioned.

⁵ H. Rickert, *Goethes Faust*, Tübingen, 1932, p. 114.

⁶ E. Kühnemann, *Goethe*, I, Leipzig, 1930, pp. 95 f.

spurning Faust with the harsh verdict: 'Du gleichst dem Geist, den du begreifst, nicht mir', becomes the embodiment of inexorable fate. Having previously commented with some sarcasm on the ingenious inventions of the 'Goethe-Philologen' in support of their theories, he is himself reduced to assuming in Faust's fervent thanks to the sublime spirit in 'Wald und Höhle' a lamentable aberration on the poet's part. 'ein überraschender, durch nichts vermittelter, völlig neuer Gedanke des italienischen Goethe'. Moreover, the youthful Faust, sublimated to the tragic representative of creative genius, seems to him 'von aller sinnlichen Gemeinheit unberührt', an assertion difficult to maintain in face of Faust's first conversations with Mephisto after meeting Gretchen.

These attempts to read a new significance into the 'Erdgeist' and the scene in which he occurs evidently lead to conflict with explicit passages in the text.

The critics of the second group believe that Goethe's intentions underwent a fundamental change between the writing of the *Urfaust* and the resumption of work on the play at Schiller's instigation in the nineties, a change which deprived the 'Erdgeist' of his vital import, since the Lord of the 'Prologue in Heaven' took over from him the care of Faust's destiny. However, the 'erhabene' or 'unendliche Geist' of the other passages—not altered either in the *Fragment* of 1790 or *Part I* of 1808—still challenges explanation. Minor¹ takes the apostrophe in 'Wald und Höhle' to amount to little more than our 'thank God', so that the Lord could be substituted without difficulty for the 'Erdgeist'. Roethe² dallies with the thought that the 'erhabene Geist' might be Lucifer, in view of certain theories of the young Goethe, recounted in *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, Book VIII. Petsch³ sees 'eine tragische Täuschung' in Faust's belief that Mephisto has been sent to him by the 'Erdgeist'. Rickert⁴ would identify the 'erhabene Geist' of 'Wald und Höhle' with the 'Allgeist', or, as Goethe has it, the macrocosm, and distorts the rhythm to 'du hast mir nicht umsonst Dein Angesicht im Feuer zugewendet' in order to carry his point.

Could even Goethe have intended to hoodwink his readers to this extent? Is no simpler explanation possible?

I would recall that after the discovery of Fräulein von Göchhausen's manuscript of the *Urfaust* in 1887 Goethe scholars found themselves con-

¹ J. Minor, *Goethes Faust*, Stuttgart, 1901, pp. 351 ff.

² G. Roethe, *Die Entstehung des Urfaust*, 1920 (in *Goethe*, Berlin, 1932, p. 84).

³ R. Petsch, *Neue Beiträge zur Entstehung des Urfaust*, 1920 (in *Gehalt und Form*, Dortmund, 1925, pp. 316 f.).

⁴ H. Rickert, *Goethes Faust*, Tübingen, 1923, pp. 239 ff.

fronted by the startling epithet 'in wiederlicher Gestalt' used in introducing the 'Erdgeist' and subsequently deleted. One and all discard the usual meaning of the word in favour of 'schroff abweisend, feindselig' or something to this effect, of which some examples, besides many of the modern use, can certainly be found in Goethe;¹ also the final outcome of the scene would appear to justify this reading. Closer inspection, however, seems to me to show that the 'Erdgeist' is at first by no means hostile but rather graciously inclined, appreciative of the great effort of volition which drew him from his sphere, and only becomes scornful when he sees Faust cringing in abject terror. This collapse of Faust is commonly explained by the sheer immensity of the vision vouchsafed to him, or else by an overwhelming sense of the tragedy of life, of Nature's cruel indifference to the sufferings of the individual, conveyed to Faust by what he sees and borne out anon by the words 'Geburt und Grab, Ein ewiges Meer Ein wechselnd Leben'. There is doubtless some truth in this interpretation, but it should be remembered that Faust is at no time given to facile optimism and is ready to face suffering.

Traumann,² Witkowski³ and Kuhnemann⁴ rightly detect here an early hint of the incorporation of evil as a necessary factor in God's universe, which did not emerge clearly until the 'Prologue in Heaven'⁵ was added soon after 1800, and they grasp at a possible explanation of Mephisto's apparent and puzzling subservience to the Earth Spirit. However, a vague sense of makeshift still remains, for why should the 'Erdgeist' choose Mephisto among all spirits in answer to Faust's 'mächtig Seelenflehn' (l. 488), a choice which at first sight appears gratuitously insulting? I would therefore suggest a reconsideration of the problem with the help of Goethe's original wording. Why water down the meaning of 'wiederlich' when the meaning 'repulsive' is quite consistent with the forceful language of the Storm and Stress Goethe? Why not assume that Faust, whose conception of nature was revealed in the lines addressed to the moon (ll. 392-7), where he hopes for limpid radiance and cleansing dew, was shattered by seeing in the 'Erdgeist', despite the grandeur of the apparition, something actually suggesting the ugliness of life, something even more revolting than is expressed by Werther's cry in the letter dated 18 August: 'Ewig verschlingendes, ewig wiederkäuendes Ungeheuer!'? This would give full force to his exclamation: 'Schreckliches Gesicht!'

¹ O. Pmower, *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, XLX, 244; and P. Fischer, *Goethe-Wortschatz*, Leipzig, 1929.

² F. Traumann, *Goethes Faust*, I, München, 1920, p. 52.

³ G. Witkowski, *Goethes Faust*, II, Leipzig, 1924, p. 156.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, I, 319.

⁵ See ll. 336-343.

(l. 482) and account for his referring to the 'geschäft'ge Geist', to whom he feels so near, with the words: 'Und nicht einmal dir!' (l. 517).

If this element of ugliness in the 'Erdgeist' be conceded, then Mephisto, who maliciously entoids Faust in the meshes of sex, endeavours to undermine his instinctive rectitude (ll. 3041-9), his belief in innocence and selfless love (ll. 3525-8), and to sully the young fresher's hope of good learning, can at *all* stages in the genesis of the play be regarded as the emissary of the 'Erdgeist', his mission being to initiate Faust into the murky depths of life and thus to test his capacity for comprehension without losing hope, and the strength of his determination never to sink into slothful acquiescence—in other words, Faust's right to say:

Ich fühle Mut, mich in die Welt zu wagen,
Der Erde Weh, der Erde Glück zu tragen,
Mit Stürmen mich herumzuschlagen
Und in des Schiffbruchs Knirschen nicht zu zagen. (ll. 464-7)

Then the words 'Du gleichst dem Geist, den du begreifst, nicht mir!' (ll. 514 f.), would amount to 'Lerne mich begreifen, wenn du mir gleichen willst', and Mephisto would fulfil the double function of being a means to this end and of ultimately vindicating the Lord's confident assertion in the Prologue in Heaven:

Ein guter Mensch in seinem dunklen Drange
Ist sich des rechten Weges wohl bewusst. (ll. 328 f.)

By thus revealing himself to be the patron of *all* manifestations of life—seamy or otherwise—and yet at the same time the weaver of God's living garment, the 'Erdgeist' would become the natural transmitter of God's permission to Mephisto to try his worst during Faust's earthly existence (ll. 315 f.).

I am fully aware that Goethe's letter to Graf Brühl¹ in which he advises that 'überhaupt nichts Fratzenhaftes, nichts Widerliches erscheinen dürfe' seems to invalidate my interpretation, but I contend that this letter was written some forty-five years after the scene to which it refers by a Goethe who had steadily moved away from the vivid realism of his youth. Is the Goethe who suggested the head of the Jupiter of Otricoli as a model for the 'Erdgeist', but declared himself flattered when he heard that his own counterfeit had been used,² is this Goethe really to be trusted as to the original inspiration of 1774? The pencil sketch reproduced by Witkowski,³ whenever it was made, betrays unmistakably the

¹ 2 June 1819 (W.A. *Briefe*, xxxi, 162 f.). Graf Bruhl had begged advice as to how the 'Erdgeist' should be represented on the stage.

² See Witkowski, *op. cit.*, p. 200.

³ *Op. cit.*, *Bilderanhang* 4. 20 July 1831.

influence of Italy and may be regarded as a halfway house in this change of visualization.

I may be accused of following the lead of those Goethe scholars who, having once discovered the numerous minor inconsistencies in the poet's works and his utterances about them (how tantalizing is his way of revealing so much, save always the essential!), assume that they know better what was going on in Goethe's mind than he did himself. I maintain, however, that discrepancies as to the outward appearance of the 'Erdgeist' weigh light as compared with the safeguarding of the fundamental unity of conception in the play, disputed by so many, but repeatedly asseverated by Goethe, not only in his old age when Part II was nearing completion,¹ but also in a passage written at the time when the supposed change—the decision to save Faust from eternal damnation—is averred to have taken root in Goethe's mind.² For, as Korff³ clearly recognized, if Mephisto can be shown to be an integral factor of God's world-order already in the *Urfaust* then, by implication, Goethe can never seriously have envisaged Faust's damnation. Then the issue—even if Goethe would not have been prepared to formulate it at this stage—must always have been on the lines of the wagers between God and Mephisto, Mephisto and Faust, the stake must even then have been Faust's adherence to his instinctive belief, regardless of repeated failure and recurring guilt, in the value of experience, or rather of the unremitting battle it offers against the forces of inertia.⁴ Then no change of plan, no new departure need be assumed and Goethe's words would be vindicated: 'Ich wusste schon lange her was, ja sogar wie ich's wollte'.⁵

W. E. DELP.

LONDON.

¹ An Heinrich Meyer (W.A. *Briefe*, XLIX, 101); An Wilhelm von Humboldt, 17 March 1832 (op. cit., p. 281).

² See *Italienische Reise* (W.A. XXXII, 288).

³ Op. cit., p. 295.

⁴ Cf. Korff, *Faustischer Glaube*, where the whole action of the play is made to hinge on Faust's 'Lebensglaubigkeit'.

⁵ An Heinrich Meyer, loc. cit.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

ALEXANDER BARCLAY

There is one incident in the life of Alexander Barclay which is not mentioned by any of the authorities—*C.H.E.L.*, *D.N.B.*, Jamieson, or Beatrice White.

The accounts of the Communar of Wells Cathedral show payments to him in 1547 as Master of the Cathedral School:

(a) *in stipendio magistri Alexandri Barkeley doctoris ludimagistro* (sic) . . £12.

(b) (from another source) *in stipendio magistri Alexandri Barkleyi Doctoris magistri Scholarum* . . . 26s. 8d.

Cf. *Calendar of MSS. of Dean and Chapter of Wells*, Hist. MSS. Comm., II, 267–8.

I have not been able to discover the accounts of the immediately preceding and following years, nor is anything known (so far as I am aware) of him in connexion with the school.

This was the year of the Chantry Commission. The commissioners reported that ‘The same Deane and Chapiture of their ffree will kepe and maynteyne a free gram̄er Scole ther, and do paye to the Mr of the same Scole yerely for his stipend or wages, xii*li*. v*j*s. viii*d*., and to the vssher of the same—v*j* *li*. xii*j*s. iii*j* *d*.’

From the mention of the usher (not usually named) it has been conjectured that Barclay took little part in the affairs of the school.

He was at this time Vicar of Wookey, some two miles distant.

L. S. COLCHESTER.

WELLS, SOMERSET.

TWO MIDDLE FRENCH EXPRESSIONS

A. *Placebo*

Godefroy registers the word *placebo* in three senses: *flatterie*, *homme intrigant*, *vêpres des morts*. Bescherelle Aîné, in his *Nouveau Dictionnaire National*, Paris, 1887, says: ‘*Placebo* s’est dit autrefois pour un courtisan qui cherche à plaire au prince. *Loc. prov.* aller à *placebo*, aller au devant du bon plaisir de quelqu’un, flatter.’

None of the above senses, however, is applicable to *placebo* in the following examples. In the *Journal d’un bourgeois de Paris* an entry for

25 September 1413 (dealing with the downfall of the Cabochiens and the restoration of the royal power) runs as follows:

Et faisoient crier la paix aux samedys es halles; et tout le plat pays estoit plein de gens d'armes, de par eux. Et firent tant par placebo, qu'ils orent tous les greigneurs bourgeois de la ville de Paris de leur bande...

No comment has been made by the editor upon *placebo*.¹

Again, in the *Chroniques* of Chastelain, Bk. VII, First Part, ch. 59, referring to the defection of the duke of Brittany who, having made peace with the French king, sent news of this step to his ally, Charles of Burgundy, the author says:

Et manderent par Bretagne, roy d'armes, a deux placebo, au duc leur allié, qui se crucifioit de leur honte.

The note to *placebo* by the Baron Kervyn de Lettenhove is 'Je ne comprends pas cette expression'.

In relation to the former extract, but not without significance for the second, we may quote two passages from the royal decree of 12(?) September 1413:²

... plusieurs de nos bons parens et amis et de noz bons et loyaux subgiez, et de nostre fille l'Université et aussi plusieurs bons bourgeois et notables personnes de la ville de Paris se mirent ensemble et vindrent devers nostre dit filz le duc de Guienne et devers nostre dit oncle de Berry, en leur disant tous a une voix qu'ils *vouloient la paix* et leur requrent qu'ils montassent a cheval, et qu'ils vouloient vivre et mourir avecques eux *pour tenir la paix*.

... Nous, a l'aide de nostre Seigneur, gouvernerons nostre royaume et les officiers d'icellu, moennant bonne justice, *en bonne paix et tranquillité*...

It can be concluded from these quotations and the above extracts that, in addition to the senses given by Godefroy and Bescherelle Aîné, *placebo* must have signified an official document or proclamation indicating a state of peace or appeasement. The word is evidently borrowed from the first person singular of the future of *placere*.³

An analogous borrowing from this verb is found in *placet*, meaning 'requête adressée à un souverain, à un ministre, à un tribunal' (Godefroy records examples for 1365 and 1389).

That *placebo* should have been borrowed to designate a document or proclamation of the type suggested is, then, not surprising.

¹ Jonquères edition, p. 66.

² Cited in full by Viollet from the copy in the library of Chartres in the *Mém. de l'Hist. de Paris*, IV, 158-67. Other versions include one in Latin in the *Chron. du relig. de St-Denis*, V, 171 ff. and another in French in Monstrelet (ed. Douet d'Arcq), VI, 109.

³ This would mean that its use is not derived from the *placebo Domino* of the first antiphon at Vespers in the Office for the Dead, as is the case for the other senses of the word, but from the confusion between *placere*, *placare* and *pacare*, testified to by the sense of *placidus* and the development of *placibilis*. The former developed from the sense of *pleasing* to that of *peaceful*, the latter from *pleasant* to *peaceful*.

B. *A haques et a maques*

On p. 171 of Viollet's article cited above is found the following extract from Christine de Pisan's epistle, probably written just after the massacres subsequent to the new triumph of the Cabochiens in Paris after Agincourt:

le diabolique menu peuple qui mieulx ne demandast, a touz leurs haques et maques...

Viollet appends the notes:

Haques. C'est à dire probablement *haches*. *Maques*, Peut-être pour *massues*, Passage corrompu.

Neither word offers any real difficulty.

Haque, frequently written *hacque*, meaning *hoyau*, is probably from the Middle Netherlandish 'hacke' or 'hac', cf. Valkhoff, *Les mots fr. d'origine néerlandaise*, p. 157, and Mellema, *Dict. françois-flameng et flameng-françois* (Rotterdam, 1610-20), *hacke*: houie.

Maque or *macque* is the Picard form for *masse* (d'armes) or *massue*, cf. Hécart, *Vocab. rouchi-français* (Valenciennes, 1834), *macque*: massue, en parlant d'un bâton qui a une boule au bout.

It should be remembered that Picardisms were current at this time and that many Flemish words had found their way into the French language. The expression which Viollet comments upon is not infrequently found, cf.

grand nombre de communes s'esleverent a hacques et a macques.

(Chastelain, *Chron.*, Bk. I, ch. 73)

ses amis, a hacques et a macques...

(Molinet, *Débat de la chair et poisson*, 1.228)

The favour which this expression enjoyed at this time can perhaps be accounted for by the rhyming effect of the two words. The passage of Christine de Pisan in question cannot, therefore, be adjudged corrupt because of these two forms.

NANCY JONES.

CARDIFF.

A 'PRÊTRE PHILOSOPHE' IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY—

JACQUES-JOSEPH LE BLANC

The police agent d'Hémery, whose official title was 'exempt de robe courte', has left us three remarkable volumes of notes¹ which constitute a sort of Writers' Year-Book for 1749, compiled from the point of view of a police censorship always on the look-out for attacks on religion,

¹ Bibliothèque nationale, Nouvelles acquisitions françaises, 10781-10783.

authority and especially reputations. D'Hémery's records contain, along with not unfamiliar anecdotes concerning Voltaire and other writers of note, a host of illuminating references to lesser talents and forgotten scribblers. The Chevalier de Mouhy, for instance, is here revealed as a police spy, and we are informed that Marmontel and Fréron, having had words on the steps of the Comédie Française, were brought before the Maréchal d'Isenguien who dismissed them with the insult 'gibier de police' ringing in their ears, a story which is even less to the credit of the authorities than of the two authors. L'abbé Prévost again, 'in his 54th year' (he was in fact 52), 'grand, blond et bien fait' and living in the Rue Neuve des Petits Champs, appears chiefly as 'un libertin qui prend le titre d'aumônier du Prince de Conty et qui a plusieurs maîtresses (la Damonville a été la sienne pendant longtems)'.

Amongst many entries of this kind to which his professional bias gives a scandalous turn, d'Hémery tells a story which would not be out of place, so sharp is its piquant realism, in Diderot's *Jacques le fataliste*. It has moreover a special interest for the student of eighteenth-century rationalism.

Jacques-Joseph Le Blanc, otherwise known as Père Antoine, a 'recollet' or reformed Franciscan, '29 years of age, 5 feet 2 inches in height, and with a face terribly disfigured by smallpox', spent his time, in his convent cell at Versailles, not in monkly meditation but in the composition of a novel and of a work entitled *Le Tombeau des préjugés sur lesquels se fondent les principales maximes de la religion*, which, from the summary d'Hémery gives of the book, appears to have been a rehash of a work composed about 1700 and widely circulated in manuscript form under the titles *De Tribus Impostoribus* and *Traité des Trois Imposteurs*.

Il fait voir [writes d'Hémery (vol. I, f. 46)] que l'homme dans la plupart de ses actions cherche à tromper et se laisse tromper; il écrit que les preuves que l'on donne de l'existence de Dieu sont toutes ridicules & sophistiques, et qu'elles ont été inventées par la politique et quelle est la religion naturelle. Il vient ensuite aux religions juive, chrétienne et mahometane qu'il regarde comme des inventions des hommes. Il réfute la Genèse et les autres livres sacrés et les regarde comme des comptes faits à plaisir, d'où il conclut qu'il n'y a rien de miraculeux; il explique ensuite la Loi et les Miracles de J. C. après il découvre la fourberie de Mahomet; on lit au bas de son manuscrit: fait en la ville du Soleil (qui est à Versailles ou il demeurait lorsqu'il le fit); au Serail des Hypocrites (qui est son couvent), au n° 16 (qui est le n° de sa chambre).

[f. 46v] Il est aussi auteur d'un petit roman intitulé *Les Adorateurs dupés*, qui selon toute apparence contient sa vie.

Voici la façon dont il a été découvert et arrêté.

Un nommé Valentin âgé d'environ cinquante ans, sans état et tout à fait deseuvré, ayant connu ce pere, qui étoit alors à Versailles, parce qu'il fut chargé de lui faire des complimens d'un M. Noël officier de Milice, qu'ils connoissoient l'un et l'autre, lequel lui avoit fait espérer qu'il pourroit lui rendre quelque service pres de M. le Comte d'Argenson, dans la visite qu'il lui rendit à ce sujet, ce pere promit de l'obliger, et

comme Noel avoit prévenu Valentin que ce pere avoit de l'Esprit, il le flatta beaucoup sur ses talens, au point que ce pere le conduisit dans sa chambre, le fit déjeuner et lui montra ses ouvrages, en lui disant que s'il pouvoit trouver un libraire, qu'il seroit charmé de les faire imprimer. Valentin lui promit. En conséquence il revint à Paris, et le Pere fit l'impossible pour y venir aussi, a quoi il réussit. Alors il écrivit a Valentin et lui envoya le detail de son livre contre la religion, en l'assurant que s'il pouvoit trouver quelque Libraire qui voulut l'acheter, qu'il le recompenserait bien. Valentin au lieu de le servir comme il lui avoit promis, le trahit et fut trouver M. L'archeveque de Paris, a qui il [f. 47ro] compta toute l'histoire pour en tirer de l'argent. Ce Prelat lui donna sur le champ une lettre pour M. Berryer¹ pour faire tout ce qui seroit necessaire pour arreter ce Pere en flagrant delit. Ce magistrat m'envoya Valentin avec lequel je pris des mesures, et quelques jours après ce Quoquin parvint a faire accepter a ce pauvre Recolet un rendez vous ou il se rendit deguisé pour vendre ce Livre.

Ce fut l'après midy et chez Valentin que ce Recolet se deguisa, ensuite ils furent ensemble chez Dasse, traiteur, rue Poissonniere a la Croix d'or. Ce pauvre Recolet, qui avoit quitté sa robe pour prendre un vieux habit noir, la veste de même, une vieille perruque et le reste a proportion, avoit l'air d'un voleur de grand chemin, resta dans une chambre et Valentin lui fit accroire qu'il alloit chercher le libraire et un de ses amis, qui étoit le Commissaire de Rochebrune et Gauthier, qui contrefirent bien leur rôle, étant arrivés, il leur fit la lecture de son ouvrage, mais un instant après le S. D'Hémery entra, saisit le manuscrit et conduisit ce pere chez M. Berryer, qui le fit mener a la Bastille sur le champ.²

Quelques jours après Valentin vint me dire que M. l'archeveque l'avoit mal recompensé.

Le 26 juillet 1749 il a été rendu a son couvent pour le faire renfermer.³

Le 1^{er} Aout le couvent de Paris l'a fait transférer a S^t Denis ou il a resté en prison, jusq'au 14 juin 1750 qu'il a eu sa liberté pour aller a Verdun ou a Metz.

Le 14 7^{bre} 1751 je l'ai rencontré a Verdun et j'ai appris qu'il demeurait dans le couvent de cette ville.

Here d'Hémery loses interest in Père Antoine and it is left to the imagination to picture the barren and embittered existence of this contemporary of Jean Meslier, curé d'Etrigny, and many another free-thinking priest to whom no Vicaire Savoyard had preached a consoling 'religion of the heart'.

J. STEPHENSON SPINK.

LONDON.

¹ Lieutenant général de police.

² Confirmed by *lettre de cachet* dated 17 June 1749: 'Mons. de Launay, Gouverneur de mon chateau de la Bastille. Mons. de Launay. Je vous fais cette lettre pour vous dire que mon intention est que vous receviez en mon chateau de la Bastille le Pere Jacques Joseph Le Blanc dit le Pere antoine récolet et que vous l'y reteniez jusqu'a nouvel ordre de ma part. Sur ce je prie dieu qu'il vous ait Mons de Launay en Sa Ste Garde. Ecrit a Marly le 17 Juin 1749 (signed) Louis (countersigned) d'Argenson.' Arch. de la Bastille, 11681, f. 12.

³ Confirmed by Archives de la Bastille, 11681, f. 13, letter similar to the above, dated from Compiègne 21 July 1749, and ordering the liberation of the prisoner

REVIEWS

Unpathed Waters. Studies in the Influence of the Voyagers on Elizabethan Literature. By ROBERT RALSTON CAWLEY. Princeton: Princeton University Press; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1940. viii + 285 pp. 22s. 6d.

Professor Cawley draws in this book 'some of the conclusions and inferences for which the proof is to be found in' his earlier work, *The Voyagers and Elizabethan Drama*. The scope of the present work will best be made clear by quoting the titles of the main topics: the Heritage of the Middle Ages, the Maps, the Spirit of the Voyagers, Seamen and the Sea, Characteristic Uses of the Voyagers.

Some interesting and useful inferences emerge from these studies; that, for example, the authority of classical geography was so strong that not only did the later map makers repeat geographical errors but they deliberately suppressed new discoveries. Then, too, that the part played by the maps in preserving fresh in men's minds the strange monsters of classical story has not been sufficiently realized.

Professor Cawley discusses the use a few prominent Elizabethan writers made of voyaging material; one wishes that he could have added to these Marlowe, Shirley, or even Brome. Apart from allowing for the personal tastes and aims of the writers, little allowance is made for changes in dramatic fashion. Indeed, Professor Cawley is more concerned to state observed facts than to speculate on possible causes or relationships. This is perhaps to be regretted, that with his profound knowledge of the voyagers he did not relate his study to the literary and social changes of the period. Thus the fact that an abnormal play like the *Launching of the Mary* could have been acted at all suggests an attitude among its audience vastly different from the attitude of an audience twenty years previously.

The study of the Spirit of the Voyagers is very well done. It shows clearly the mixed motives and points of view that at one time served the ends of intense romantic patriotism and at another of sordid meanness.

Professor Cawley's studies show that for the most part the contribution made by the voyagers to Elizabethan drama was in allusions and character; there is less provision of the actual plots until *The Tempest*. Here, however, judgement should be suspended as Professor Cawley has left references to the Near East largely in the hands of a fellow-worker.

J. H. WALTER.

GRIMSBY.

Ben Jonson. Edited by C. H. HERFORD, PERCY and EVELYN SIMPSON. Vol. VII. 1941. Oxford: Clarendon Press. xxvii + 814 pp. £1. 15s. 0d.

The seventh volume of the great Herford-Simpson *Jonson* is before us, and it is the doughtiest of them all so far in bulk. Nor is this to be

wondered at. For it contains and deals with the whole series of Jonson's *Masques* and *Entertainments*, as well as *The Fall of Mortimer* and *The Sad Shepherd* which occupy only sixty-four out of the eight hundred odd pages. The *Masques* and *Entertainments* fill the remaining seven hundred and fifty pages, no surprising space to those who have had to use hitherto the packed double columns of the old one-volume *Ben Jonson*. And they cover the steady labours of the poet over some thirty years as a purveyor of such productions. We cannot but share Mr Simpson's satisfaction, expressed in his Preface (p. viii), that

the complete *Masques* of Jonson, for the first time in their history, now appear in a scholarly text

There are two especial reasons for sharing this justifiable pride. The first is that the *Masques* have been much neglected by scholars and readers, and the present editors, in this part of their immense task, had little help indeed from any predecessors. The second is that the *Masques*, despite this neglect, are one of Jonson's major claims to greatness. They display a never-failing fount of imaginative and creative ingenuity. They arise out of a learned and well-stored mind. And they contain much of his noblest poetry in a sustained exhibition of his universally competent verse-craft. Whoever does not read and study the *Masques* does not know Ben Jonson.

Mr Simpson's Preface gives some indication of the completeness of the inquiries and preliminary labours which have made his text truly scholarly. It is forty years since he began the necessary work upon the archives at Chatsworth which, long ago, led to the making of the beautiful volume of Inigo Jones designs for *Masques* published by the Malone and Walpole Societies, and which now is fundamental to the present work. Manuscripts and printed texts, wherever they were to be found, have been consulted.

And Mr Simpson, in a Preface which almost fulfils the purpose of a review, pays due tribute to his printers. Anyone who is familiar with the glorious holograph manuscript of *The Masque of Queens*, Royal MS. 18 A. xlv in the British Museum, is bound to look with curiosity upon this modern attempt to reproduce such copy in type, and to compare it with contemporary efforts. For Mr Simpson is not content to reproduce the available Quarto. Be it remembered that not only have we the text, with the poet's voluminous notes interspersed both marginally and across the body of the page. We have also to consider the necessity for substantial editorial footnotes giving variant readings from the Quarto and the Folios. A difficult page to lay out: nor do frequent raised letters in the poet's script facilitate the matter. Very wisely, however, no attempt has been made at a typographical facsimile in utmost detail, or to indicate in the footnotes minutiae in the manuscript. With suitable distinctions of type, a true and close typographical picture of the manuscript is given, while at the same time the reading of the text is facilitated. And the page, to a reader of contemporary books, is pleasing. I would single out,

for example, p. 291. One cannot but call this master-printing, and be grateful to Mr Johnson and the Clarendon Press. I have been struck, in examining these pages, by the fact that even these tight compartments of small type preserve the register with remarkable exactness. The closest examination of the text, with the help of the MS. facsimile opposite p. 290, reveals only an intrusive short hyphen, '*&-ignorabiliter*'. No wonder Mr Simpson is satisfied, critical as his eye is for matters typographical. The paper and the binding continue to be worthy of the work of author, editor and printer.

Incidentally, a word might fairly be said here in defence of Ben Jonson's own printers against the too-common notion of the ugliness and incompetence of Elizabethan and Stuart printing, repeated again in a recent handbook on literary history of some authority. The *Jonson* folio of 1616, for example, set the Clarendon Press no mean standard of skill in its struggles with the difficulties of its copy, whatever its errors in detail.

It is impossible in present circumstances to deal critically with the main importance of this volume, which is the establishment of a definitive text of the *Masques*. No one can doubt that this object has been achieved. Where a check is possible, the text is proved accurate, and it is based on the widest research, the fullest information, and the most meticulous principles. The *apparatus criticus* is ample.

The notes in the List of Illustrations exhibit the wide resources of the learning of the editors, and we may here, though not here alone, trace the hand of Mrs Simpson. The editors have received generous help in all quarters, and it is with regret that one observes (p. xvii) an exception to this universal generosity.

I should have liked occasionally a fuller account of manuscript sources, for example, of the second MS. of *An Entertainment of the King and Queen at Theobalds*. Why, incidentally, do both MSS. end at l. 125, stopping short of the concluding song? And how is the one related to the other?

C. J. SISSON.

LONDON.

The Language of Satirised Characters in 'Poetaster', a socio-stylistic analysis, 1597-1602. By ARTHUR H. KING. Lund: Gleerup; London: Williams and Norgate. 1941. pp. xxxiv+258. 10 kr.

This is an important application of detailed philological analysis to a text which, from the direction of its satiric aim, can be counted on to yield significant results. The word 'philological' is used advisedly; the author's aim is 'neither purely linguistic nor purely literary but philological'. He acknowledges a double allegiance—'philological duplicity'—to the Lund and Cambridge English schools. The tradition of the former, that is, of Professor Ekwall, accounts for the bulk of the book—

its scale of research, its technique of exposition, its 'linguistics'; the tradition of the latter can be traced in its governing aim and in brief, but generally meaty, paragraphs of summary and evaluation.

Approximately 217 pages are devoted to a classified commentary on the words, figures, phrases, etc., used by the characters of *The Poetaster* grouped according to their social type or grade. The lexical and semantic analysis follows for ease of reference the tabulation of the *N.E.D.*, but is frequently able to supplement its information. A mass of supporting and comparative material is drawn from relevant plays—chiefly by Dekker, Marston and Shakespeare. It is clear that significance must largely depend on sound classification and meticulous distinction. What we find must sometimes appear to the impatient almost wire-drawn in its meticulousness. Thus, Ch. 1 handles the Crispinus-Marston relationship *via* a series of sections and sub-sections. (i) expressions peculiar to Crispinus, (ii) expressions peculiar to Crispinus and Marston's work; (iii) expressions used by Crispinus alone and common to Marston's and other work, (a) by Crispinus as rimer and gallant, (b) by Crispinus as rimer, (c) by Crispinus as gallant, (iv) expressions used by Crispinus alone and found in other work but not in Marston's; (v) expressions common to Crispinus and other characters in *The Poetaster*. All these are then briefly recapitulated in 'Summary of 1-v' and 'Conclusions'. Similar methods are pursued for the Julia (or Court) group and the Tucça (or Street) group. These chapters are, indeed, strenuous going. The reader must, if the rhetorical categories are unfamiliar or uncongenial to him, think himself back into that industrious ardour which Richard Sherry and Abraham Fraunce demanded of their readers and sharpen it to a modern analysis. He must be prepared to identify and discriminate mixed, adjectival, pronominal, alloquial and substantival *epanalepsis* and he must train himself to be agile with the *N.E.D.*

It is impossible in the space of a review to offer adequate notices of the rich haul of words and forms accumulated here. I can merely note some features of interest and I shall select points of varying weight and type, so as to give some idea of the book's nature and range.

It is, in my opinion at least, a welcome feature that the Stage-quarrel is so firmly held in proportion. The author brands as 'uncritical' the itch to identify *tout simple* characters in literature with persons in real life. It is interesting to see how the analysis of Crispinisms (see the summary of Ch. 1 given above) leads from indubitable Marstonisms to no Marstonism at all—in other words, the facts of language show that Crispinus is not just Marston. He is a character in a play, a type compounded by a mind capacious as well as angry, a blend of several ingredients, of which the personal is only one. He is the product, as he should be, of the recognized processes of literary creation.

The richest piece of language study is provided by the uninhibited speech of Tucça. Here, accepting the evolution of Tucça out of the once-living Captain Hannam by the same processes of literary creation, we are

justified in tracing relics and echoes of actual Elizabethan speech—not book-talk. In Tucca's language, running the whole gamut from magniloquence to the *argot* of street and brothel, we have Jonson's mind, interest and observation working at full stretch. Mr King finds in Tucca the most important character, the 'centre of energy' of the play. This is not everyone's opinion, but since in those days language was a barometer in a sense in which it is so no longer, this view seems to me well-based.

The writer's own English is sometimes darkened by extreme compression and by occasional out-of-the-way words. There is a justifying purpose behind some consistently-used Elizabethanisms. Thus, the spelling 'copie' (instead of the misleading 'copy') will probably commend itself. 'Complement(ary)' is used regularly instead of 'compliment(ary)' with the object of forcing us to include in the word its wider Elizabethan content. I have noted only one momentary ambiguity from the consequent inability to distinguish 'complement' from 'compliment'. This is not a book to go to for fine phrases—for 'complement', in fact—about the 'miracle' or otherwise of Elizabethan language; it is a work of reference and information. Space is, however, found in the closely-packed critical paragraphs to enforce by variation the nature of the stylistic revolution under way by 1597—from 'copie' to 'sentence', 'from a mainly schematic to a mainly tropical style' (p. 194) and to finger-post the way by a number of just and illuminating *aperçus*.

The book, at an opportune moment, nails the colours of Philology to the mast. It is a valuable demonstration of the importance of lexical, semantic and rhetorical studies. It exemplifies the philological discipline necessary for the complete and scholarly reading of Shakespeare and Jonson. It is interesting to see what a poet-worn epithet like 'fair' yields under Mr King's methods (pp. 80-3), and, at the other end of the scale, to test how far with his assistance we can recognize and gauge the true colloquial note and its class-nuances. This study gives ground for hoping that by the collection and sifting of such exact and exhaustive philological data a way may be found of bringing various vexed problems of allusion, authorship, influence, etc., nearer to solution.

G. D. WILLCOCK.

ENGLEFIELD GREEN.

The Works of George Herbert. Edited with a Commentary by F. E. HUTCHINSON. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1941. lxxvii + 619 pp. 30s.

This is the final, all-inclusive edition of the writings of George Herbert, English and Latin. Everything has been roped in, even his translation of a treatise on temperance, and a huge assembly of Outlandish Proverbs and Jacula Prudentum of which the nucleus had been formed by the poet. This is, of course, as it should be, and yet, speaking entirely for himself, the present writer could have spared a good deal of the Latin prose and verse to give space for a rather fuller commentary and a critical study of Herbert by one who knows him so well. All that the

editor does is excellent, but I should have been glad of more had space allowed of it.

I confess I have always found Herbert a somewhat difficult poet, in certain ways more difficult than Donne, at least in the *Divine Poems*, though Donne's poems, I am told and well believe, require more of comment than my long labours with the text and canon left me time for. The personal link between Donne and Herbert, through the younger man's mother, and their common classification as 'Metaphysicals', has tempted us to imagine a closer resemblance in their poetry than a careful reading justifies. As divine poets they are poles asunder. Passion and thought are the twin elements pervading Donne's best religious verse; and the centre of his thought and passion is his own tormented soul, if the circumference is God for a closer contact with whom he is perennially striving. The constituent elements of Herbert's poetry are feeling and fancy, feeling of many moods, the central mood a love of God to which Donne never quite attained; a fancy that delights itself in many ways from the shape of a poem or the number of lines in a stanza to emblems and allegories and conceits that are seldom those of Donne. And personal as Herbert's poetry is, the personal blends with, and sometimes gives place to, the didactic. The poem becomes a little sermon, for himself and for a Christian audience. Indeed, there is to my mind a closer link between Herbert and the Emblem writers, Quarles and his sources, than between the tormented Dean and the pastor of Bemerton who has had his ambitions and conflicts, and is susceptible to many changes of mood, but finds in resignation so deep a peace and contentment—the mood of 'Sweet day so cool, so calm, so bright', the lovely 'I made a posie while the day ran by', and the wonderful 'Love bade me welcome'. Canon Hutchinson has recognized this link with Quarles in one poem, and it might readily be found in others. The preacher predominates more entirely in the poems of Quarles, but not always. 'Why dost thou shade thy lovely face' is as personal in reference as anything of Herbert, and as passionate, if like most of Herbert's personal poems it is also addressed to the Christian as such.

The difficulties in Herbert's poems are not due to any great difficulties in the text as was the case with Donne's poems. Mr Hutchinson has based his text on the Bodleian MS. with constant reference to the Williams MS. which shows corrections of earlier versions in Herbert's handwriting. But for spelling, punctuation, capitals, and italics he has wisely followed the edition of 1633. The beautiful Nonesuch edition suffered, as I have pointed out elsewhere, from neglecting the guidance of the printer, Thomas Buck, 'the best printer that Cambridge had yet had', so Mr Hutchinson; and he points out that the fifth edition (1638), the last for which Buck was responsible, shows by some of the corrections that a fresh reference had been made to the MS., so that for the collector for whom the word 'first' is not a fetich this edition has the same interest as has the second edition of *Paradise Lost*. The difficulties in Herbert's

poems arise from a probably intentional element of enigma in his titles (*Jordan*), individual poems and lines, and overcompressed phrases. But indeed there is an element of enigma in the life and character of Herbert. There was no transition, as in St Augustine and Donne, from a licentious to a pious life. In Herbert's early career piety and worldly ambition were combined with no consciousness of conflict, at least on religious grounds. His hesitations about taking orders were, in so far as they were not due to the self-distrust that must beset any serious man on taking such a step, social rather than religious. He had no doubts either about Christianity or the Anglican Church; but to become a parish priest was, as his friends told him, 'too mean an employment, quite too much below his birth, and the excellent abilities and endowments of his mind'. His poems express no sense of repentance for his early worldly ambitions—his canvas for the Oratorship, his opening dissertation on an oration by James himself, kingly oratory, a thing unknown to the ancients. For the outrageous flattery of James in his orations Mr Hutchinson pleads that we must remember he is speaking for the University and in its interests. That hardly applies to the disquisition on 'kingly oratory'. But it is difficult for us to judge the attitude of those for whom favour alone could secure a career. The point I wish to note is simply that Herbert's poems express no such note of repentance for definite sin as do Donne's. The burden of a poem like *Affliction* or *The Collar* is that God has broken and overruled all his own inclinations and intentions, and the close is a note of passionate resignation:

Ah, my deare God! though I am cleane forgot,
Let me not love thee, if I love thee not.

The Latin poems on the death of his mother are to me, too, a little of a puzzle. Are they the symptoms of what is called to-day a 'mother-fixation' or a proof that Herbert can play wittily even with a real and deep sorrow? I suppose a little of both, if most Latin elegies, including Milton's *Epitaphium Damonis*, leave the present writer with a sense, if not of insincerity, yet of a rather detached sorrow. He would except a beautiful poem by Dean Inge on the death of a little daughter. One at any rate of Herbert's is charming and its burden is that of *The Collar*:

Parvam piamque dum lubenter semitam
Grandi reaeque praefero,
Carpsit malignum sydus hanc modestiam
Vinumque felle miscuit.
Hunc fremere totus et minari gestio
Ipsius severus orbibus;
Tandem prehensa comiter lacernula
Susurrat aure quispiam,
Haec fuerat olim potio Domini tui.
Gusto proboque Dolium.

The double metaphor throughout is characteristic of Herbert.

Coming then to *The Temple*, *Sacred Poems* and *Private Ejaculations*, I will note a few points where I have found difficulty and should have been

glad of a little more comment, amounting at times to an analysis of the poem and some indication of its date. Mr Hutchinson has not commented because he presumably finds no difficulty, or accepts the interpretation of Mr Palmer, or has felt a lack of space. In the *Church Porch* I remain of Coleridge's opinion and can find at least no grammatically justifiable interpretation of the ll. 285-8

None is bound to work for two, who brought himself to thrall.

The 'who' is apparently, following Palmer, equivalent to 'Although he' has made a thrall of himself. But to make oneself a thrall *is* to undertake to do the work of another. But what of the next line:

Till labour come and make my weakness score.

Apparently you are only one till you try to be more and then you find that it is your weaknesses which abound. It is certainly a very 'harsh' construction, to use Johnson's favourite word. In the *Agonie* (p. 37), do the last two lines really *reverse* the 'doctrine of transubstantiation'? I am not a theologian, but to me it seems that, applied to the Mass, they express what the Catholic doctrine affirms that what is in truth God's blood is to our senses wine. But is the reference to the sacrament? Is it not wider? The love which has cost Christ the Agony is to us a source of refreshment and joy. In *Affliction* (pp. 46-8) I should like to feel sure as to the order of events. Palmer refers (ll. 16-17)

Therefore my sudden soul caught at the place,
And made her youth and fierceness seek thy face

to his marriage and ordination. But this can hardly be correct, for the loss of friends comes later: 'for my friends die'. I take it the reference is to the decision to consecrate himself to religious poetry in the sonnets dedicated to his mother in 1610. Thereafter came the pleasant days 'straw'd with flow'rs and happiness', his career as a student, his fellowship and the post of orator, pleasant days marred only by ill-health: 'Sicknesses cleave my bones.' He alludes to his sickness in the letters of that date to Danvers. Thereafter came the loss of his friends and hopes. He was confined to an academic life till he came to the point when he could neither continue such a life nor find another. More sickness followed and at the moment

What thou wilt do with me
None of my books will show.

The poem was, I suppose, written between 1626 and 1629. Herbert's *Repentance* (pp. 48-9) is in a very different tone from similar 'ejaculations' by Donne:

Oh my black soule, now art thou summoned
By sicknesse, death's herald and champion

Oh make thyself with holy mourning blacke
And red with blushing as thou art with sinne;
Or wash thee in Christ's blood, which hath the might
That being red, it dyes red soules to white.

I think one *must* take *Jordan* (pp. 56-7, 102) as a title for religious poetry of which *Jordan* is the *Helicon*. In both poems Herbert's complaint is of too much elaboration, by other poets as well as by himself. No poetry should spring so directly and simply from the heart. In the *Holy Scriptures* (p. 58) 'watch a potion' must, I agree with the editor, mean 'blend to compose a potion', but it is a harsh construction. Even harsher is the last clause in *Content* (pp. 68-9):

Then to have hellish moths still gnaw and fret
Thy name on books which may not rent

where the editor suggests that 'rent' is used, as 'tear' can be, intransitively. But why should the books not tear? The variant in 1638 comes apparently from the Williams MS. I suppose 'vent' would mean 'sell' (intrans). Your name may live on in an unsaleable book, always there for fresh generations of critics to discover and condemn. Still more difficult is the closing verse of *The Quidditie* (p. 69):

It (i.e. a verse) is no office; art, or news,
Nor the Exchange, or busie Hall:
But it is that which while I use
I am with thee and *most take all*.

The editor accepts, at least records, the interpretation of Mr Middleton Murry that 'Herbert in his poetry comes nearest to God and most partakes of the creative power that sustains them all'. I wonder if Herbert would have thought of his gift of writing poems as in a way on a par with the creative power of God. I rather think it was with Young's *Conjectures on Original Composition* and later German criticism that 'creation' in an almost mystical sense began to take the place of 'imitation' in poetic theory. I suspect that Herbert meant merely that to be with God is to possess every good; but he would have done well to recall Horace's warning:

Decipimur specie recti: brevis esse laboro
Obscurus fio.

I confess that Herbert's allegories, as *Humilitie* and *The World*, are not quite clear to me. Humility apparently allots each of our animal passions to the control of an appropriate virtue. Strength must be guided by gentleness; the quick perception of danger by fortitude; justice by a brain as subtle as the fox's; passion or angry jealousy by temperance. But what is the Peacock's plume? I suppose Palmer is right in interpreting it a 'worldly splendour'. Why does the peacock not bring it—too proud, I suppose, and why is it left to the crow—because he is naturally a robber? In the fine poem *Constance*, what is the 'markman'? The word has a meaning in Freemasonry, but that is irrelevant. If the metaphor of bowls is sustained, then I take it the meaning is the man who tries to direct his partner's bowl, show him where he ought to lay it. In *Ungratefulness* (p. 82) the two rare cabinets are those doctrines about the Godhead to which no natural reason can attain—the Trinity and the

Incarnation. The second is comprehensible to us because we are incarnate spirits. But alas! in the box of the body we keep another box stored with our favourite sins. We thus defraud God who has given the two cabinets hoping for the return of a *single* heart. In Mr Hutchinson's note I should be inclined to italicize 'single' rather than 'heart'. Herbert's *Decay* is the source of Vaughan's *Corruption*. It is a strange thought for a Christian that after the Incarnation there should be less knowledge and love of God than in the days of the patriarchs. But the Christian mind seems always to be averse from any thought of progress, though the words of Christ seem to imply that the least in the Kingdom of Heaven knows more of God and his love than John the Baptist and all the prophets. In a note on the seventh verse of *Obedience* (p. 105) Mr Hutchinson quotes from Littleton's *Tenures* a meaning of purchase. To my mind the central meaning of the poem is clearer if one take the word in the more general sense of 'buy'. Herbert has spoken of 'conveying', 'presenting' his heart to God. He then pulls himself up:

To one word I say, NO:

All is purchase. The price that God has paid is more than sufficient to make all I could give already his by purchase:

When in the Deed there was an intimation
Of gift or donation,
Lord let it now by way of purchase go.

If Herbert's friend Bacon had read the poem *Providence* (pp. 116-21), he might have reminded him of his own lesson that 'if any man shall think by view and inquiry into these sensible and material things to attain the light whereby he may reveal unto himself the nature and will of God, then indeed he is spoiled by vain philosophy: for the contemplation of God's creatures and works produces (having regard to the works and creatures themselves) knowledge, but having regard to God, no perfect knowledge but wonder which is broken knowledge.' All the arrangements which Herbert notes are wonderful, but not all well calculated to give us a spiritual understanding of God's nature and moral lessons for ourselves:

Birds teach us hawking; fishes have their net:
The great prey on the less, they on some weed.

To Milton these are evidences of the Fall:

Beast now with beast gan war, and fowl with fowl,
And fish with fish.

One very difficult line Mr Hutchinson has left without a note because, I suppose, like myself, he does not understand it:

Clouds cool by heat, and baths by cooling boil.¹

Palmer gives an interpretation which may be correct but certainly is not to be got out of the words taken grammatically. *Divinitie* (pp. 134-5)

¹ The first half may refer to generation of heat in clouds, causing precipitation of rain (Seneca, *Natural Questions*, II). For the second half, cf. Fynes Morison (1907, I, 243) 'And this water, though cold to touch, yet seems to boile', also Camden (*Britain*, 1610, 233) on Bath springs which 'boile up', fed by 'rivers of fresh water'. (Editor.)

has always seemed to me one of the happiest of Herbert's neat poems in its comparison of the doctrines of theology with the contemporary astronomical theories of cycles and epicycles. I would have welcomed a fuller exposition of the *Pilgrimage* (pp. 141-2) in its relation to Herbert's career. It is as difficult, if less mystical than Vaughan's *Regeneration*. The hill is, I suppose, as Palmer maintains, the priesthood; but does Herbert really speak of Bemerton where he did so much for others and gained so much in spiritual growth as 'A lake of brackish waters'? One does not like to think so. I was at one time tempted to think that the first hill was the Oratorship and all that it promised of advancement (which might, as in Donne's case, have been clerical); but I could not work it out. But what in Herbert's life is described as the 'wilde of passion'? Such moods and moments, I take it, as that described in *The Collar*. The difficult sixth line of *The Jews* (p. 152) is another example of Herbert's overcondensed constructions. 'And now by keeping the letter lose the letter', i.e. its deeper significance revealed in Christ.

I have touched on these, to me, few difficulties (there are others), to indicate why I should have welcomed a little more of the editor's excellent notes, a brief analysis of a poem such as he gives for example of *Joseph's Coat* and some suggestion of the period of the poet's life at which the poem was composed, though I am glad he has made no attempt to rearrange the obviously intentional order of the volume, so clearly indicated by the poems which are gathered at the end. To re-read *The Temple* is to be reimpressed by the variety of moods they express and the richness of the fancy employed to give them the kind of expression that seemed to the poet suited to what he felt and fitted to communicate the lesson he wished to draw from his own experiences. Herbert, more even than Cowley, is our great example of a poet in whom fancy rather than imagination in the fuller sense of the word is the dominant factor, but fancy controlled and guided by an entire sincerity of feeling and conviction of mind.

On Herbert's Latin poems I have no special qualification to speak. They have the neatness which one would expect. Indeed, it was probably from the habit of writing Latin verses that he acquired the neatness in working out his little sermons, allegories and paradoxes in *The Temple*. *Aethiopissa* (p. 437) is, the editor says, the most secular poem Herbert wrote, or one of them. The poem 'A blackamoor Mayd wooing a fair boy' I have met in more than one MS. The source of the fancy is perhaps in a poem by Marino of which I made a copy from the now lost Burley MS. I cannot find it in *La Lira*, but it may be in another volume:

Vn gentiluomo ama una sua schiava Mora

Nigra si, ma sei bella, o di Natura
Fra le belle, d'Amor leggiadri nostro,
Fosca é l'Alba appote; perde e s'oscura
Presso l'ebano tuo l'avorio e l'ostro,

Hor quando? hor dove il mondo antico o'l nostro
 Vide si viva mai, senti si pura
 O luce oscur di tenebroso inchiostro
 O da spento carbon nasce arsura!
 Servo di chi m'e serva, ecco ch' avvolto
 porto di bruno laccio il cor intorno
 Che per candida man non fia mai sciolto.
 La dove nasci o Sol sol per tuo scorno
 Un sole è nato, un sol chi nel bel volto
 Porta la notte e' ha negli occhi il giorno.

H. J. C. GRIERSON.

EDINBURGH.

John Dryden: Some Biographical Facts and Problems. By JAMES M. OSBORN. New York: Columbia University Press. 1940. xiv + 296 pp. 23s. 6d.

In many ways this book might be taken as a model by students wishing to produce a solid piece of work for the purposes of a research degree and, later, of a book. There is nothing clever in the choice of the subject—materials of similar quality lie everywhere to hand in our libraries—and the author wins approval because of his steady industry, carefulness and common sense. Mr Osborn speaks of the definitive biography of Dryden as a thing which modern studies are 'leading up to', and he has had the good sense to attempt nothing more than a critical study of the biographies we have already, beginning with Birch's and ending (to count the last considerable one) with Saintsbury's. The merits and shortcomings of these biographies are well assessed, and Mr Osborn adds what he himself has been able to discover about a subject by no means yet exhausted. This humbler kind of research is what is most needed at the present time. The definitive biography, when its turn comes, will need to be as well written as the biographies of Johnson, Scott and Saintsbury, and even more voluminously and minutely learned than Malone's. Till more new material is discovered and till the requisite writer appears, that biography should not be attempted. Meanwhile, Mr Osborn's book will take its place among those half-dozen Dryden classics of this century which have helped to solidify our knowledge of Dryden the man and of Dryden the poet. (When naming T. S. Eliot and Mark van Doren as present-day critics of Dryden, Mr Osborn might have referred to Verrall's lectures; and surely Hugh Macdonald has done something more interesting than coldly 'augment' our information about the bibliography of Dryden's writings.)

Mr Osborn has divided his book into two parts. Part I is devoted to the biographies of Dryden, which are treated as stages both in Dryden studies and in the art of biography. It is completed by appendices transcribing the bulk of the MS. notes with which Malone prepared for the second edition that was never required, and providing more detailed analyses of the contributions of Scott and Christie. Part II, 'Collateral

Investigations', contains a number of studies in the 'learned journal' manner. These discuss 'The Medal of John Bayes' (reasserting the case for Shadwell's authorship); Dryden's employment by Herringman; Dryden and the King's Playhouse in 1678 (an examination of the petition of the King's Company, a document which, by means of modern photography, is here for the first time completely transcribed); his London residences; his absences from London; his relationship with Walsh (here printed for the first time are five letters from Walsh to Dryden) and with Langbaine; books from his library; and, finally, Dryden family traditions as they existed a hundred years after his death. The book concludes with eight 'Shorter Studies'. (Mr Osborn's own studies may have their importance for the future historian of biography: he may be the first biographer, or the first academic biographer at least, to refer to vitamin D.)

On p. 61 Mr Osborn is caught expressing unbalanced views of the relative importance of Dryden's writings and of the recoverable facts of his life:

.. Malone suppld most of the details now known about the poet's early years. These include not only additions to the literary canon, like the verses to Hoddesdon, but more important matters as well. Thus Dryden's family connection with the Pickering's, and also its relation to his early career, were first pointed out by Malone.

Nevertheless, one of Mr Osborn's most interesting and careful chapters is that discussing Dryden's alleged employment by Herringman. He has gone through the entries in the Stationers' Registers for the years from 1656 to 1664, turned up what books he could that were published by Herringman, and argued that the matter prefacing seven of these books may be the work of Dryden (two of the pieces are signed 'J.D.'). These pieces are printed on pp. 177-83. Some day someone may compare the diction of these pages with that of Dryden's acknowledged verse and prose, a long labour in the unfortunate absence of a concordance. There are similarities between them, to say the least; and similarities also connecting the known work of Dryden with the translation of a piece in Brome's *Horace* also signed 'J.D.' (The word *gust* used in this translation may be compared with its use at *Absalom and Achitophel*, i, 20, and perhaps with the *degusted* on p. 180 here; and the word *flat* in the same translation with *flat* on p. 179 here.)

Mr Osborn's discussion of Dryden's annotations of his copy of the 1679 Spenser ends with the suggestion that 'Dryden was comparatively indifferent to Spenser until the appearance of [this] edition'. (Mr Osborn counters with a simple negative Dryden's statement that he remembered Chaucer's using the word *gride*. 'This word was not, however, used by Chaucer'; I should like assurance that Mr Osborn's negative is not simply based on the evidence of a Chaucer concordance, but on a reading of Chaucer in the edition which in all probability Dryden himself read him in, i.e. Speght's, which is inflated with pieces and passages now known or considered to be apocryphal).

Mr Osborn's transcriptions of documents reproduced in facsimile are not impeccable. We cannot, therefore, cheer him up when he fears that his transcripts of Malone's MS. may have suffered from their not having been checked (p. 118). On p. 65 Malone's notes are stated to be frequently misnumbered. on p. 45 Mr Osborn's own footnotes skip from 17 to 19.

GEOFFREY TILLOTSON.

LONDON.

The Correspondence of Richard Steele. Edited by RAE BLANCHARD.
London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1941.
xxviii + 562 pp. 35s.

Steele is one of the most likeable personalities of his age, and, as his private letters as well as his published writings show, very far from being the 'sentimental debauchee' of Swinburne and popular tradition, or the 'poor Dick Steele' of Thackeray. Indeed, none of the well-known portraits of him is true to its original, for though most of them lay stress on the kindness, gentleness, humanity which his works and his biography reveal, nearly all of them fail to do justice to his no less characteristic moral courage and his powers of mind. Steele was not a profound or a consecutive thinker, but he was a man of high intelligence and in all things honest and sincere. This, added to his natural gift of expressing himself, makes his correspondence well worth re-editing to-day.

Apart from a selection, the only collected edition of Steele's correspondence before the present is that of John Nichols (second edition, 1809). Needless to say, many letters of Steele's have come to light since then, and though most of these have been noticed by Steele's biographers, Aitken and Connely, Miss Blanchard gives us their text in full, accurately and painstakingly annotated. The general reader can, as Miss Blanchard suggests, overlook the notes, and the special student of Steele can refer to them trustingly. The matter of the collection has been divided into General Correspondence, Family Correspondence and Miscellaneous Printed Letters and Papers (including the probably genuine though edited letters to Mrs Manley, Steele's dedications, his short Journal and prayers). In the first of these groups the additions to Nichols's collection are numerous, many of the letters printed by him in this section being public dedications, relegated here to the third group. In the charming group of family correspondence Miss Blanchard has less matter to add. Nichols's text is not always quite accurate, and he seems to have allowed himself an occasional alteration for clarity's sake or to fit in with the customs of his day; he also revises freely (and sometimes unwisely) Steele's punctuation: this has all been restored to its original, and correct or more probable dates have been assigned to some of the letters printed by him. Miss Blanchard has excluded all political pamphlets of Steele's even when they are of personal interest and written in the epistolary form. Full references to them are, however, given in notes.

The chief value of this edition is in its collecting together and annotating many entertaining and characteristic letters from scattered sources. It also contains, however, twenty of Steele's letters not hitherto published. Some of these are mere notes, but some of them are of literary or biographical interest. Thus letter 23 (a fragment) gives Steele's scheme for improving the Gazette, letter 73 proves that Nos. 46, 47 and 48 of the Guardian (on Mme de Maintenon) were written by Ambrose Philips, letter 87 seems to confirm Oldmixon's attribution of the procession on Queen Anne's birthday, 1714, to the Hanover Club.

J. W. R. PURSER.

GLASGOW.

The Rise of Romantic Hellenism in English Literature 1732-1786. By B. H. STERN. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Publishing Company for the author. 1940. x+182 pp. \$2.25.

The sentimental admiration for Greece was the fruit of the archaeological interests of wealthy and aristocratic English patrons. It was encouraged by the foundation of the Society of Dilettanti about 1732 which financed expeditions to the Near East for the study of architectural remains. The account of their travels by Stuart and Revett in *The Antiquities of Athens* in 1762 provided scholars throughout the world with accurate descriptions of the monuments of ancient Greece, and this was only the first of a series of English travel books of which Richard Chandler's *Travels in Asia Minor*, 1775, his *Travels in Greece*, 1776 and Robert Wood's *Antient and Present State of the Troade*, 1767, were the most popular and influential. Wood, like Chandler, was a considerable scholar, and his essay *On the Original Genius of Homer* which he prefixed to this volume first set the Greek poet against his proper geographical and topical background. Robert Adam, the most famous of the four famous brothers, won the first round in the battle for the Hellenists over the Gothicisers with his *Ruins of the Palace of the Emperor Diocletian at Spalato in Dalmatia* in 1763, and for many years English domestic architecture was inspired by the classical ideal. All these works, and more which followed, have in common a sentimental admiration for ancient Greece whose glory they still found reflected in an idealized modern counterpart. This generous sympathy which these books aroused was to have the most important political repercussions during the whole of the nineteenth century, and, indeed, its influence is with us yet.

Mr Stern proceeds to trace this Hellenism in English poetry through Thomson, Akenside, and the Whartons, to Thomas Gray and William Whitehead. Such knowledge, he rightly claims, is indispensable for the proper understanding of *Childe Harold* or the ode *On a Grecian Urn*. But he does less than justice to Shaftesbury in his appraisal of classical influences in English literature, though he recognizes that Akenside's *Pleasures of the Imagination* are, for the most part, versified versions of

his ethical doctrines. But Shaftesbury did more than spread the Platonic Kalos k'agathos, and through his lengthy stay in Naples had become a discriminating connoisseur of classical art. His *Entablature of the Judgement of Hercules* of 1713 had provided Lessing, it is well known, with his argument in favour of the 'pregnant moment' in sculpture, and his revival of Neo-Platonism had revolutionized the conception of beauty for the later eighteenth century. By his insistence that feeling was the chief criterion of judgement, and that the artist's object was to recapture the divine beauty emanating from its sole source, God Himself, Shaftesbury had dealt a mortal blow to the theory of imitation which had ruled since the Renaissance. In proclaiming that 'Beauty is Truth, Truth Beauty', Keats owed more to the aesthetics of Shaftesbury than to the sentimentalities of the Neo-Hellenists.

It may well be that Mr Stern over-estimates the influence of Winckelmann for the period with which he is dealing. It admittedly did not reach its full force until Fuseli gave an account of his views in his translations of 1765. It would appear, moreover, that Germany was herself more indebted to English scholarship than is generally realized. Winckelmann himself pays an indirect tribute to Shaftesbury when, quoting from Proclus in his famous *Gedanken* of 1755, he maintains that there was more than 'la belle nature' in the Greek masterpieces, 'there are ideals of beauty derived from concepts of the mind'. In the eighteenth century the English led the world in Greek scholarship with Bentley, Wood, Blackwell and Porson. They taught even Heyne in Göttingen a lesson, and Herder was deep in their debt. 'Wie sehr haben uns die Engländer hier schon vorgearbeitet' he writes of Blackwell's *Enquiry into the Life and Writings of Homer*. This book, significantly enough, is on Goethe's reading list in his Strassburg student days. Lessing's sources for *Laokoon* were as much English as French. But Winckelmann scored by his intuitive apprehension of the Greeks and his brilliant characteristic of their art as 'serene greatness and noble simplicity'. Half truth though it was, it met with such sympathetic understanding in England because it coincided with a deep-rooted objection of the English to excesses of all kinds whether in life or art. Its practical illustration is to be seen in the carefully balanced, slightly sentimentalized figures of John Flaxman such as have been familiar to generations of students of University College, London. As these lines were written the Flaxman Gallery was still intact, though the dome above it has been damaged by Winckelmann's twentieth-century compatriots! It was Flaxman, the belated follower of Spence and Caylus, in whom Goethe took so lively an interest when he reviewed his compositions on subjects from the Greek poets and from Dante.

Mr Stern's bibliography will prove invaluable to later workers in the field, though the 'Literature of Greek Travel', by F. L. Lucas, in the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, xvii, 1938, was worth including. Mr Stern is not very sure of himself when quoting from the German, as the thirty odd mistakes in the equal number of lines from

Riedesel's *Reise* go to prove. It seems waste of space to print two translations of Winckelmann's famous description of the Laocoon statue within six pages of each other. Herder's version of the Alcestis story was entitled *Admetus Haus* and not after the devoted wife.

L. A. WILLOUGHBY.

LONDON.

The Poetical Works of William Wordsworth. Poems written in Youth. Poems referring to the Period of Childhood. Edited from the manuscripts with textual and critical notes by E. DE SELINCOURT. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1940. xvi + 380 pp. 21s.

This is the first volume of the projected edition of Wordsworth which should crown Dr de Selincourt's work on him. The arrangement of the poems is to be Wordsworth's own, and the first 258 pages accordingly agree with the first pages of most editions in containing Wordsworth's first two divisions, the *Poems written in Youth* and the *Poems referring to the Period of Childhood*. In spite of this coincidence of arrangement, however, there is even in these first pages a difference from earlier editions, in that Dr de Selincourt's text is much more fully collated with the MSS as well as with the first and the later editions printed in Wordsworth's lifetime. No one before him has been able to give such prolonged study to so many MSS., particularly those now in the Wordsworth Museum at Grasmere. As he himself writes (p. viii):

A special importance attaches to early transcripts of poems whose publication was long delayed. Thus *Peter Bell*, written in 1798, contemporary with the first *Lyrical Ballads*, and *The Waggoner*, written in 1805, were not given to the world till 1819; *The Borderers* and the greater part of *Guilt and Sorrow* lay in manuscript for nearly half a century; an examination of their original versions adds to our knowledge of Wordsworth's mind and art where the study offers the most alluring problems, and is likely to be most fruitful in its results.

Nor are these MSS. of poems which have, after all, been known now for over a century, the only source for the study of Wordsworth's development.

Of unique value are those manuscripts which go back to the poet's formative years, from his school and college days till 1797. Here can be traced his early sensitiveness to nature and his surroundings, his youthful subservience to current literary fashions and his violent reaction from them, and, with the maturing power of self-criticism, the gradual emergence of his own essential style and personality.

Dr de Selincourt's pamphlet, *The Early Wordsworth*, of some years ago gave some notion of the amount and quality of these early poems and fragments, and in the Appendix here he prints them, from the *Lines written as a school exercise* at the age of 14 to *The Vale of Esthwaite*, the astonishing *Fragment of a 'Gothic' Tale*, the translations and embroiderings on the classics, and the *Argument for Suicide* which probably belongs to 1796-7. The annotations, which follow these *Juvenilia*, include Wordsworth's own printed notes, the Fenwick notes, and enough textual and

other explanatory comment to bring out the history of the composition and revisions of the text and to indicate Wordsworth's early reading and borrowing, but are not so full as to get in the reader's way.

The general effect of the volume, although it does not attempt to follow the chronological order of the poems even where this can be ascertained—the *Juvenilia* are the Appendix, not a prologue—is to emphasize the earlier work and at the same time to illustrate the continuity and the changes in Wordsworth's poetical development and thought. With regard to *An Evening Walk* and *Descriptive Sketches*, perhaps the most thoroughly revised of all Wordsworth's poems, Dr de Selincourt follows the same plan as in his edition of *The Prelude*, printing the 1793 and the revised text in opposite pages, with most of the variants at the foot of the page and a few relegated to the notes; with the rest, again with some exceptions in *Guilt and Sorrow* and *The Borderers*, where MSS. provide lengthy and considerable passages of difference, variants go to the foot of the page. The result cannot be helped: this is an edition for study, not for pure immediate delight. Yet the intellectual pleasure of observing Wordsworth's changes of thought and expression, and speculating on their possible causes, remains and is strengthened by such study. *Guilt and Sorrow* offers the most familiar and in some ways the most complex problems, *The Borderers*, with its later introductory essay, some of the most interesting comment on Wordsworth's own development. This essay, already discussed by Dr de Selincourt in his *Oxford Lectures on Poetry*, has, like so much of Wordsworth's political and psychological writing, a startling relevance to present conditions.

Perhaps there is no cause which has greater weight in preventing the return of bad men to virtue than that good actions being for the most part in their nature silent and regularly progressive, they do not present those sudden results which can afford a sufficient stimulus to a troubled mind. In processes of vice the effects are more frequently immediate, palpable and extensive. Power is much more easily manifested in destroying than in creating. A child, Rousseau has observed, will tear in pieces fifty toys before he will think of making one. From these causes, assisted by disgust and misanthropic feeling, the character we are now contemplating will have a strong tendency to vice. His energies are most impressively manifest in works of devastation... He has rebelled against the world and the laws of the world, and he regards them as tyrannical masters; convinced that he is right in some of his conclusions, he nourishes a contempt for mankind the more dangerous because he has been led to it by reflection. Being in the habit of considering the world as a body which is in some sort of war with him, he has a feeling borrowed from that habit which gives an additional zest to his hatred of those members of society whom he hates and to his own contempt of those whom he despises... Such a mind cannot but discover some truths, but he is unable to profit by them, and in his hands they become instruments of evil.

He presses truth and falsehood into the same service. He looks at society through an optical glass of a peculiar tint; something of the forms of objects he takes from objects, but their colour is exclusively what he gives them; it is one, and it is his own. Having indulged a habit, dangerous in a man who has fallen, of dallying with moral calculations, he becomes an empiric, and a daring and unfeeling empiric...

It will easily be perceived that to such a mind those enterprizes which are most extraordinary will in time appear the most inviting...

Benefits conferred on a man like this will be the seeds of a worse feeling than

ingratitude. They will give birth to positive hatred. Let him be deprived of power, though by means which he despises, and he will never forgive. It will scarcely be denied that such a mind, by very slight external motives, may be led to the commission of the greatest enormities. Let its malignant feelings be fixed on a particular object, and the rest follows of itself...

We are too apt to apply our own moral sentiments as a measure of the conduct of others. We insensibly suppose that a criminal action assumes the same form to the agent as to ourselves. We forget that his feelings and his reason are equally busy in contracting its dimensions and pleading for its necessity.

It is a long way from the often amusingly experimental *Juvenilia* to this grave and balanced observation and analysis.

The present difficulties of book-production may delay the appearance of later volumes of this edition, but the first volume both stands by its own value and raises hopes that the rest may follow within a measurable period.

EDITH C. BATHO.

LONDON.

Les adverbess en -MENT compléments d'un verbe en français moderne. Étude de classement syntaxique et sémantique. By HANS NILLSON-EHLE. (*Études romanes de Lund*, III.) Lund: Gleerup. 1941. 242 pp. 10 Sw. kr.

Till we read this work we had a poor opinion of adverbs in *-ment*. We smiled when Philaminte admired them:

*J'aime superbement et magnifiquement:
Ces deux adverbess joints font admirablement,*

or when the gendarme, on or off the stage, rolled them on his tongue (*conséquemment, instamment, précédemment*). We thought them convenient, but commonplace in appearance, intolerable when repeated, and generally less expressive than prepositional phrases: *aimer fureusement* seemed to mean *aimer avec toutes les fureurs de l'imagination*, but failed rather dismally to say so.

Now we know better. Adverbs in *-ment* shine forth as an interesting group, very large, but very select, belonging to an exclusive club with strict rules of membership. To be admitted, adjectives must not only by taking thought add *-ment* to their stature, but make the consequential changes decorously, without offence to already existing words or to the laws of reason. It is not every adjective that can do this; for instance, *content*, *convexe* and *corpulent* cannot; *hautain* and *possible* scarcely can; adjectives of colour cannot, without losing their colour (*vertement*), unless sponsored by Goncourt (*rougement*) or Verlaine (*rosement*). Analogy is not a sufficient recommendation; *calmement* has been admitted, but not *sereinement*; *ravissantement*, but not (thank God) *charmamment*. Such matters, however, Dr Nillson-Ehle treats only incidentally. What has most contributed to raise these adverbs in our esteem is the infinitely subtle and varied character of their relations with verbs. This is his subject, and his method of dealing with it is classification.

Not in the old categories (adverbs of time, manner, etc.). In the new (functional and semantic), adopted from Professor Charles Bruneau, of whom he is a distinguished pupil, and, in a less degree, from the late Professors Brunot of Paris and Ettmayer of Vienna. Invoking the principle of Function, Dr Nillson-Ehle excludes from his survey all cases where an adverb in *-ment* modifies anything else than a verb, such as an adjective (*agréablement doux*) or a whole sentence (*Malheureusement il est parti*). The wealth of material which he has collected, mostly from recent literary prose, is thus admirably homogeneous. Applying the principle of Sense, he gets his adverbs in *-ment* into three *general* classes, according as the adjective from which they are formed expresses an idea of quality (*joli*), of quantity (*grand*), or of relationship (*antérieur*); an adjective which has a complex sense and expresses simultaneously more than one of these three ideas appears in more than one class. He then proceeds to subdivision of his adverbs into more special classes, under Sense, and to further analysis, under Function; e.g. an adverb whose function is to modify the verb, may also, by its meaning, stand in particularly close relation to another part of the sentence, such as the subject (*Il le repoussa durement*) or the object (*Il traînait lourdement ses phrases*)—and have thus a sort of secondary function.

To test the value of this classification, let us take just one of the 700 adverbs in the Index, but a good one, *longuement*. Its treatment, in seven different places of the book, comes to this: Whereas the adjective *long* expresses an idea of quantity (in time or space), *longuement* expresses an idea of quality; it is never quite synonymous with *longtemps*, not even (despite Littré) in *vivre longuement*; because the mind always dwells to some extent on the detail, cp. *Il parla longuement contre Carthage*, as opposed to *Il parla longtemps*. But though *longuement* contains a qualitative element, it may also have a marked sense of duration, which is quantitative (*Elle regarda les fenêtres du château longuement, tâchant de deviner*, etc.). In some cases 'il est impossible d'imaginer une quantification de l'idée d'action ou de procès même. Mais alors on a nettement l'impression d'un tour de style recherché qui n'est pas dans le mouvement naturel de la langue (*Un gentleman... s'acheminait, la lueur d'un cigare à la main longuement gantée, vers la plage*. VILLIERS DE L'ISLE-ADAM). L'idée de "long" se rapporte ici, d'une manière parfaitement exclusive, à l'idée substantielle du "gant" contenue dans le verbe'.

Longuement is thus classified as sometimes an 'adverb of quality', sometimes 'an adverb of quantity'. This seems less enlightening than the old classification 'adverb of manner' and 'adverb of time', which recognizes that an idea of manner can be expressed in terms of time, and vice versa. *Il parla longuement contre Carthage* conveys the manner ('long-winded' or 'full', 'comprehensive', 'detailed', etc., according to the extent of the author's or the listener's or the reader's pro-Carthaginian sympathies) in terms of time ('excessive' or 'adequate', according to their taste in oratory). We see nothing to prevent even *longtemps* being

used to express an idea of manner in suitable contexts, e.g. in a report by a sardonic listener: *Il [Hitler] parla longtemps*, almost = *interminablement*. But essentially *longtemps* is an adverb of time and *interminablement* is one of manner. In *Elle regarda longuement*, etc., the adverb 'modifies' the verb, just as *minutieusement* would, i.e. *in re* manner. *Longuement* means, among other things, that a certain amount of time was expended on the action of the verb. But so also, though less directly, does *minutieusement*, if we close our eyes on form and think only of 'ideas'.

The old classifications recognize that the nature of the 'modifying' depends on the meaning of the verb as well as on the meaning of the adverb. But they keep the discussion within practicable limits. The new classification, hospitable to 'ideas', opens the door very wide indeed; thus *à la main longuement gantée* conveys a great number of 'ideas', being in fact a most expressive phrase, but their precise interrelationship and their relative importance seem matters of personal impression. Our own is that the idea of 'long' relates more closely to the idea of *main* than to the idea of *gant* contained in the verb. To us neither 'quantity' nor 'quality' seems helpful here, but 'manner' does; *ganter* implies a comparatively good fit and the manner of the fitting was 'long', or looked 'long'. Why? Perhaps because the 'gentleman' had a long hand. Perhaps because he wore gloves going well up the wrist. Perhaps because the light effects, the cigar . . . but to 'ideas' there is no end, and opinions may well differ as to the point at which the pursuit of them ceases to be grammar or even style. There are cases where *non* means *our* or *parfaitement*. But the fact remains that *non* (and *aucunement*, etc.) are negatives in grammar.

Dr Nilsson-Ehle's classification is interesting and illuminating because, like any intelligent regrouping, it shows known facts in a fresh light, but chiefly because in the process the elusive phenomena of syntax are subjected methodically to the closest analysis by an acute mind, finely sensitive to the niceties of French style. But as a practical means of dealing with admittedly awkward grammatical relationships the new categories seem to us nebulous and less helpful than the old.

R. L. G. RITCHIE.

BIRMINGHAM.

Anthology of the Provençal Troubadours. By R. T. HILL and T. G. BERGIN. New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1941. xv+366 pp. 30s.

The preface to this book opens with the statement that no anthology of Provençal poetry with an English glossary and notes has as yet appeared. This is not strictly correct; there was, for instance, D. B. Kitchin's *Introduction to Provençal Literature* (Williams and Norgate, 1888), but it is true that no book on the scale of that before us has

hitherto been published in English. The editors hope that their work may be of use to beginners who may not have a working knowledge of other languages and 'to many who, while not desiring to prepare themselves primarily for advanced work in the field of Romance philology, would yet find pleasure and profit in a study of troubadour poetry'. The book contains 114 lyric pieces, preceded by the *vida* of each troubadour, and six non-lyric selections. The various lyrical genres are represented, there are notes, a glossary, index of proper names, table of conjugations and a bibliography.

The texts, with few exceptions, are taken from the critical editions which have been published of various troubadours. Of the lyric poems, one-half appear in Appel's *Chrestomathy*; the present sixth edition of this work has undergone a good many years of constant criticism and revision and is now as nearly 'definitive' as any such collection of texts is likely to be. Yet, for some occult reason, the editors in several instances desert Appel for earlier and less adequate editions. Richard de Berbezilh, for instance, *Atressi com l' olifanz* (Appel, no. 29), is taken from the edition by Chabaneau and Anglade, Montpellier, 1919. Editors are now generally agreed to separate an enclitic pronoun from the previous word by a full stop; Chabaneau and Anglade used a colon, *e: l*. In the text as reproduced by our editors a mixture of full stops and colons appears as diacritical signs; this inconsistency is due to the bad printing of the Montpellier press; the lower dot of the colon at times failed to make contact with the paper. These vagaries are faithfully reproduced in the text before us, a testimony to the accuracy with which the texts in this volume have been copied, but not, in this case, particularly helpful to the beginner. De Lollis and Paul Meyer did not use these signs when editing nos. 134 and 152. Some attempt has been made to insert them, but many cases where they are needed have been missed; the latter extract has been re-edited by Appel (no. 7 of his *Chrestomathy*) with the exception of the last three lines, and might well have been used by the editors of this anthology. A worse case is Peirol, no. 103; here the text has been taken from Mahn's *Werke* and, as emended, varies between *e. l* and *e' l*. Yet there is a reasonably satisfactory text available in *Poesie Provenzali Storiche relative all' Italia*, V. de Bartholomaeis, Roma, 1931, vol. II, p. 11. His reading of l. 15, *Qu' Englaterra a croy emendamen*, as against the reading of the two MSS. reproduced by our editors, *Qu' en la terra*, is certainly correct. These diacritical troubles recur in the glossary and table of conjugations; in no. 5, l. 15, *si. m breu non ai ajutori*, under *Breu* we find *.m*; under *en* we find *'n*. The glossary is commendably complete and enough references are given to facilitate identification of various usages; 'moveable' *n* and *t* are marked in the glossary by a stroke under the letter; in the table of conjugations the usage of the editors varies between the stroke and a subscript dot, and in some cases neither sign is given, nor is any explanation of the meaning of these signs provided. There are no signs to distinguish close from open vowels, a matter

of great importance in the troubadour use of rime. The pages allotted to the verbs should certainly have included a brief table of noun inflexions and of pronominal usage.

Bibliographical information is somewhat incomplete. Bertran de Born has been re-edited by Appel, who has considerably improved the text; the notes on this troubadour by the late Professor Kastner (*Modern Language Review*, vol. XXVII, Oct. 1932 and following numbers) should also be consulted. There is a complete edition of the poems of Guillem de la Tor by F. Blas (*Biblioteca dell' Archivum Romanicum*, Firenze, 1934). An edition of Peirol based upon all the MSS. with the exception of N (the Cheltenham collection has been inaccessible since the death of Mr Fitzroy Fenwick) has been prepared by Dr S. C. Aston and will be published when peace returns. R. Lavaud is said to have prepared a full edition of Peire Cardenal, but to have been unable hitherto to find a publisher.

Old Provençal is a field full of stumbling blocks for the beginner and we have therefore commented upon a number of points of special importance for the lonely autodidact; it is doubtful whether he would get very far in this anthology without some external assistance and advice. But the book can be useful as a basis for class work conducted by a teacher of experience, especially if pupils were concerned who might be unable to use editions in any language other than their own. The book is excellently printed, the texts have been accurately reproduced, and they provide as complete a survey of Provençal lyric as can be expected within the space at the editors' disposal.

H. J. CHAYTOR.

CAMBRIDGE.

Voltaire and Madame du Châtelet: An Essay on the Intellectual Activity at Cirey. By IRA O. WADE. Princeton: University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1941. xii+233 pp. 18s. 6d.

The title of this work, as the author hastens to warn the reader, should not lead one to expect a full picture of the intellectual activity of Voltaire and Mme du Châtelet between 1733 and 1749. The interesting results achieved in this study are, it must be said, somewhat obscured by the method of exposition adopted by the author. In discussing points of detail, he frequently forgets that even the specialist reader is unlikely to have present in his memory all the facts and titles of works with which he himself is familiar. Thus on p. 42 we are told that Mme du Châtelet possessed a MS. copy of a work called *Élie et Énoch*; only on p. 46 are we told where the MS. is to be found—in the Voltaire collection in Leningrad. A short descriptive list of the various MSS. mentioned in the course of the book might well have been given in the bibliography. A more serious example of faulty exposition is that more than three-quarters of the essay is devoted to a discussion of the Troyes MSS. 2376–2377, entitled *Examen de la Genèse* and attributed to Mme du Châtelet. The discussion

of the authorship of this work, begun on p. 43, is interrupted after a few pages, and resumed, with inevitable repetition, on p. 108. The intervening pages are occupied by a detailed summary of the five volumes of the *Examen*. The longest chapter of the book is thus extremely tedious. Even though the summary might be justified on the ground that this MS. is not easily accessible, one feels that rather more than two out of the sixty pages might have been devoted to a discussion of a difficult, but important question: what points in this long dissertation distinguish it from other writings of the same type of the period before 1750?

Again, it is sometimes difficult to follow the author's reasoning. For example, he shows convincingly that the *Examen de la Genèse* was greatly influenced by Woolston's *Discourses on Miracles*. Yet, though Mme du Châtelet knew English well, he unaccountably assumes that she used a French translation of Woolston, and not the original. Moreover, in an appendix comparing various passages in the *Examen* and Woolston's *Discourses*, he uses a French translation, instead of the English original, 'to bring out the striking similarity between the two works' (p. 116). This is odd, especially as the translation from which he quotes can scarcely have been used by Mme du Châtelet, since it is almost certainly the work of D'Holbach and did not appear in print until 1769 (cf. *Revue d'Hist. Litt.*, 1939, p. 232).

Yet, though they are put forward by the author as incomplete and tentative, the conclusions reached in this essay are interesting and suggestive. The years between Voltaire's meeting with Mme du Châtelet and his stay in Berlin are shown to have been extremely fruitful, and it is now possible to see more clearly how the Voltaire of the *Lettres Philosophiques* developed into the *patriarche de Ferney*. The extent of the collaboration of Voltaire and Mme du Châtelet in these years cannot be exactly measured, but some interesting facts and hypotheses are put forward. The author discusses Mme du Châtelet's part in the writing of the *Traité de métaphysique*, and also suggests reasons for supposing that only a mutilated version of this work has been preserved. In discussing Mme du Châtelet's unpublished translation of Mandeville, he establishes the fact of Mandeville's influence on *Le mondain*, and also shows how, in sections of the *Traité de métaphysique* dealing with ethical problems, Voltaire was influenced by Mme du Châtelet as well as by Mandeville. Moreover, he shows how, in adding to her translation of Newton's *Principia* a new exposition of his system (*Exposition abrégée du système du monde...*), she took back and expanded the material which she had contributed some ten years earlier to Voltaire's *Éléments de la philosophie de Newton*.

In addition to their interest in metaphysics, moral philosophy and science, Mme du Châtelet and Voltaire are also shown to have had in common a strong interest in critical deism. This is especially important as it proves that there was a continuous development in Voltaire's writings from the daring shafts of the *Lettres philosophiques* to the campaign against *l'Infâme* in the Ferney period. Professor Wade analyses

the MS. *Examen de la Genèse* attributed to Mme du Châtelet, and after proving it to be a work of the period 1736-49, he shows, as convincingly as is possible with MSS. of this type and period, that it is Mme du Châtelet's transcription of the Cirey discussions on the Bible.

The interest in critical deism displayed by Voltaire during the years 1733-49 leads to a discussion of the date of composition of some of the attacks on Christianity which he published during the Ferney period. The question of Voltaire's authorship of *La religion chrétienne analysée*, which he published in 1763 or 1764, is discussed, and it is suggested that, like his *Extrait* from Meslier's *Testament*, which bears the date 1742, his draft of this work may belong to the 1740's. Similarly, the *Sermon des cinquante*, published in 1762, may well have been composed round about the date 1749 which Voltaire assigned to it. By comparing the *Sermon*, the *Examen important de Mylord Bolingbroke* (published 1766), and *La Bible enfin expliquée* (published 1776) with the *Examen de la Genèse*, Professor Wade shows that all three belong, either wholly or in part, to the period 1736-49. It is thus no longer possible to accept the theory that the year 1750 marks the break between Voltaire the man of letters and Voltaire the *philosophe*. During the period of his relationship with Mme du Châtelet, perhaps even under her influence, Voltaire was preparing for his assault on *l'Infâme* in the 1760's.

In support of this theory one might add that it was not until about 1760, and especially from 1765 onwards, that other attacks on orthodox religion came out into the open and flooded the book market. Even the works of D'Holbach, a much younger man than Voltaire, would appear to have been written several years before 1765, when it was at last considered safe to publish them. Thus it came about that works which Voltaire had completed or at least prepared in the 1740's did not appear in print until some fifteen or twenty years later. In showing that between 1733 and 1749 Voltaire was already utilizing and developing the material provided by both French and English deistic writers, Professor Wade has thrown valuable light on the least-known period of Voltaire's career, and has also made clearer his place in the development of the Philosophical movement before 1750. In this sense the present extremely interesting work is a continuation of Professor Wade's earlier investigations into French thought in the first half of the eighteenth century.

J. LOUGH.

ABERDEEN.

Diderot's Treatment of the Christian Religion in the Encyclopédie. By JOSEPH E. BARKER. New York: King's Crown Press. 1941. 143 pp. \$2.

When in 1757 Voltaire complained that some of the theological and metaphysical articles in the *Encyclopédie* were too orthodox, D'Alembert replied: 'Avec des censeurs théologiens et un privilège, je vous défie de les faire meilleurs. Il y a d'autres articles, moins au jour, où tout est réparé. Le temps fera distinguer ce que nous avons pensé d'avec ce que

nous avons écrit.' Mr Barker has analysed the three hundred or so articles which Diderot contributed to the *Encyclopédie* on the Christian religion and on ethics, and shown how they fall, broadly speaking, into four groups. Roughly one-third are based on orthodox sources, and are wholly or almost wholly orthodox. About a quarter are derived from mixed sources and are partly orthodox, partly sceptical. A somewhat smaller number show direct hostility to orthodox religion, while roughly another quarter expound Diderot's secular, utilitarian system of ethics which was to take the place of religious morality.

The difference in the tone of these articles arises mainly, though not entirely, out of the degree of prominence which they occupy. Prominent articles such as *Testament*, *Texte de l'Écriture* and *Vulgate*, based as they are on orthodox sources, could scarcely offend the theologians. Other prominent articles, such as *Christianisme*, *Miracle* and *Providence*, are superficially orthodox, but in them Diderot parades various objections to which he opposes obviously insincere replies. To make up for his concessions to the censorship Diderot used the famous system of cross-references: thus the entirely proper article *Cordelier* refers the reader to *Capuchon* where he finds an attack on futile ecclesiastical controversies. More frequently, however, without giving any cross-references, Diderot tucks away his attacks in articles which have no apparent connexion with religion, e.g. *Caucase*, *Passager*, *Promission*.

One wonders whether Mr Barker himself has not perhaps been taken in by the cautious style which the censors obliged Diderot to adopt. Pointing to the article *Encyclopédie* where Diderot declares that his first aim is to make an inventory of all human knowledge, and the second to expose certain widespread prejudices, Mr Barker maintains that the orthodox articles on religion are a fulfilment of the first aim, and the unorthodox of the second. This distinction is rather too subtle; it would no doubt be nearer the truth to attribute Diderot's caution in certain articles entirely to a natural fear of the consequences which frankness would have both for his personal safety and for the success of the *Encyclopédie*. It is with some reluctance that one offers even this minor criticism of a work which is remarkable for its admirable clarity, brevity and precision. Like the writings of René Hubert, it sheds valuable light on one more aspect of a work which, while vaguely admired as the greatest monument of the *siècle des lumières*, has only recently begun to receive the close study which it deserves.

J. LOUGH.

ABERDEEN.

The Italian Language. By M. A. PEI. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1941. xvi+272 pp. 20s.

The author's aim, to quote his words, 'is to present in condensed form and with the modifications suggested by recent research the findings of

D'Ovidio, Meyer-Luebke, Grandgent, and other linguists, and to adapt them to the ends of elementary and advanced instruction for classes in Italian linguistics in the colleges and universities of English-speaking countries'. Introductory sections on linguistic science in general, and a sensible account of the passage from Latin to Romance, are followed by chapters on the phonology, morphology, and syntax of Italian. The sections on phonology and morphology are done very competently. Though necessarily brief, they furnish a clear picture of the sounds and forms of the language. Only very few points in these chapters suggest criticism. For instance, it can hardly be said that Dante defined 'the *volgare* as ungrammatical Latin, in the year 1305' (p. 27), since the date of composition of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* can be fixed only approximately between 1303 and the beginning of 1305. At p. 96 *debbio* (< *debeo*) is given as a hypothetical reconstruction. Actually *debbio* occurs in early Italian texts. The Tommaseo-Bellini Dictionary for instance quotes an example from the *Vita di S. Dorotea*.

It seems a great pity that only very few pages, six in all, besides a few lines in the morphology section, should have been dedicated to syntax. This is particularly regrettable since a historical account of Italian syntax is a pressing *desideratum* of scholarship. Such a neglect of syntax is hardly justifiable on the ground that most points connected with it are 'the literary, deliberate efforts of the chosen few' (p. 113). The literary element is not of such a nature that it can be entirely disregarded in an account of a language: least of all in a language like Italian in which standardization was due practically entirely to literary influence. This brings us to another and equally serious omission. But for a few vague remarks at p. 139, there is no account of the causes that led to the establishment of a *koinè* in Italy. Nor is there anything about the development undergone by Italian since the thirteenth century. Early Italian is altogether sadly neglected throughout the book. The result of all this is that the beginner, for whose benefit this book is primarily intended, will not find here those historical details which are so essential in philological studies, and without which no account of a language can be called complete.

The description of Italian dialects, though necessarily condensed, will prove very valuable to the beginner, as will also the bibliography¹ and the selection of Italic, Latin, and Italian texts. Concerning these texts, their printed sources might have been furnished and, in so far as the *Ritmo Cassinese* is concerned, it would have been preferable to give the

¹ The following works on the Italian language might be added to the bibliography. W. Meyer-Luebke, *Grammatica Storica della Lingua Italiana e dei Dialetti Toscani*, nuova edizione curata da Matteo Bartoli (Torino, 1927); M. Bartoli, *Caratteri Fondamentali della Lingua Italiana e delle Lingue Sorelle*, Miscellanea della Facoltà di Lettere e di Filosofia (Torino, 1936); G. Bertoni, *Storia della Lingua Italiana—Lezioni Raccolte da U. Ciancolo* (Roma, 1934); K. Vossler, 'Italiensisch, Französisch, Spanisch, ihre literarischen und sprachlichen Physiognomien', *Zeitwende*, II (1926), 136–63; R. A. Hall, *Bibliography of Italian Linguistics* (Publications of the Linguistic Society of America, Baltimore, 1941). A new edition of Bertoni's *Il Duecento* appeared in 1939. As this edition includes some new chapters, it should have been given instead of the 1930 edition.

text of De Bartholomaeis¹ instead of D'Ovidio's rather arbitrary reconstruction of it. About the *Ritmo*, that it belongs to the twelfth century seems highly doubtful. On palaeographical grounds the unique manuscript of it must be assigned to at least the middle of the thirteenth century, and there are no really valid reasons for attributing the composition of the poem to a much earlier date.²

The weak side of this book is its omissions. None the less it is undeniably a valuable work of exact scholarship embodying the results of recent research, which will prove useful not only to beginners. Teachers of Italian philology will not easily be able to dispense with it.

R. WEISS.

LONDON.

Lessing's Laokoon. By F. O. NOLTE. Lancaster, Pa.: Lancaster Press. 1940. 175 pp. \$2.00.

Much the best work on *Laokoon* is of American origin, and the names of Walter, Bryant, Howard and, above all, of Irving Babbitt will be well known to workers in the field. Mr Nolte follows in the best tradition of his distinguished predecessors, and the present work is marked by admirable lucidity, sensitive appreciation, cogent argument and apt illustration, all presented in a language rich in association and finely phrased. *Laokoon* is a book about art, and Mr Nolte boldly examines Lessing's thesis in the light of the most modern thought on the nature of art and of artistic creation. Unlike Babbitt, he brings to his task a judgement that is open-minded as to the respective merits of those indeterminate labels 'classic' and 'romantic'.

Many holes have been picked in Lessing's arguments since Herder started the process within a year of its appearance, and Goethe later joined in the fray. The Romanticists denied the very validity of his premises. But Mr Nolte is not concerned with the narrower issues of Lessing's historical position. As he pertinently remarks: 'You can argue against the *Laokoon*; you cannot argue it away', because 'it is a consummate formulation of principles that may be profitably reckoned with'. Lessing may lay undue stress on the theory of imitation which he had inherited from the Renaissance, but he had at least an inkling of the new romantic theory of creation derived from Shaftesbury when he makes the painter in *Emilia Galotti* surmise that 'Raphael would have been the greatest genius among painters' even 'if he had, unfortunately, been born without hands'. Mr Nolte reminds us, however, of a fact too often forgotten: that the Romantic theory of 'creation' is just as powerless as 'imitation' to account for the fact of *artistic* creation. The Romantic, he points out, is, when he tediously transcribes the things within him, as naturalistic as the realist who tediously transcribes the things without.

¹ V. De Bartholomaeis, *Rime Giullaresche e Popolari D'Italia* (Bologna, 1926), pp. 11-12.

² The same applies to the Venetian inscription given at p. 192. Its attribution to the twelfth century is at least very doubtful.

Each theory has a certain validity, but neither is in itself able to provide the criterion by which art can be distinguished from that which is not art.

This, Mr Nolte maintains with insistence, can only be achieved by a proper appreciation of 'medium'. This is not to say that art consists merely in the artist's mastery over *medium*; equally important is the power of medium over the *artist*, the fascination which it exerts upon his imagination. Imagination in itself is not enough—it is, for instance, present no less in the work of a great astronomer or mathematician. What distinguishes the artist from other men of imagination, and indeed from the craftsman, is his compulsion to imagine in terms of his *medium*. 'It is not the eye of the painter or the sculptor which dictates to his hands; rather it is his hands which guide and educate his eye. For it is his hands which have immediate and vital contact with his medium; and it is from this contact that the truly fashioning impulse comes.' This in no way affects the *ecstasy* of the artist's vision. Werther thinking to enhance this ecstasy cries: 'at present, I could not draw, not even a single line; and yet I was never a greater painter than at this moment'; but he is under a delusion. The question is: In what form does an artist glimpse ecstatic loveliness? That he glimpses it in terms of medium is what distinguishes *artistic* inspiration from other kinds of inspiration. 'Medium', Mr Nolte writes, 'is the *only* source of insight and power which an artist has, and which is denied to all others.' J. M. Thorburn, who is equally convinced that 'the problem of medium is the key to the problem of art', asks in his profoundly suggestive book *Art and the Unconscious* (London, 1925): 'What is art but a synthesis of the most earthy and the most spiritual?', and Goethe, writing to Herder in 1772, recognized the affinity between the artist's creative power and his earthy, sensuous medium: 'An artist is nothing so long as his hands do not work and shape.'

Mr Nolte's recognition of the importance of medium does not lead him into the blind alley of 'pure form'. Art, he knows, can never be divorced from life and human interest. Epstein foresees an exhibition of mere stones as the logical conclusion of preoccupation with material; and Mr Nolte thinks that the entirely abstract is not an advance upon 'representation' as an aesthetic norm but its other extreme. That such experiments in medium have become an end in themselves is due to a confusion of the aesthetic with the merely physical properties of medium; and between these Mr Nolte is at great pains to distinguish.

This is, however, just what Lessing failed to do. When he insists that, because the symbols of poetry are successive, poetry can effectively 'imitate' only things which are successive, he is thinking of the merely physical qualities of articulated sound. The insight gained by seeing medium as the key to the problem of art is invaluable in any appreciation of *Laokoon*, which is itself a treatise on the limitations of artistic media. For it makes it possible to state with a greater degree of accuracy where Lessing went astray. Mr Nolte thinks that, had Lessing proceeded directly to a consistent examination of the 'ways' of the poet and the sculptor he

would inevitably have been led to an analysis of aesthetic media. But is this so certain? Despite Lessing's preoccupation with the purely physical properties of language, he betrays no sense of medium as the material in which the artist works—of him 'shaping' in the moment of his 'seeing'. Mendelssohn, who is much more aware of the sensuous in art, sometimes uses the word 'Materie'; but for Lessing medium is always 'Mittel' (means), and art the conception of some idealized 'bit of nature' communicated by 'Zeichen' (symbols). But it should not be forgotten that Lessing's difficulties are chiefly with the medium of literature, an art which, as Thorburn points out, presents unique difficulties to the student of aesthetics.

Since Mr Nolte so explicitly maintains that art has constant reference to life, what exactly does he mean when he writes that 'the impressions we receive from a work of Tolstoy, a statue of Michel Angelo, or a symphony of Sibelius are altogether different from any sensations which actual experience can ever vouchsafe us'? Does he mean that such impressions are altogether of a different order? Is it not rather that they have a different quality? Have not these impressions derived from art something in common with impressions received in actual experience when, suddenly and without warning, a new relation is temporarily established between us and what we contemplate, a relation characterized by Edward Bullough¹ as intensely personal, but filtered, cleared of the practical, concrete nature of its appeal? Be that as it may, that we question at all is evidence that Mr Nolte has achieved his aim. For he would not claim to have said the last word on art, artistic creation or even on *Laokoon*. Concerned 'not to prove, but to provoke', he writes with conviction and enthusiasm, and his book admirably fulfils the function which he assigns to criticism in general: to stimulate the mind and set it on its way to finding its own solutions.

ELIZABETH M. WILKINSON.

LONDON.

Lessings Stellung in der Entfaltung des Individualismus. By FRIEDRICH JOSEPH SCHMITZ. (*University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, xxiii.) Berkeley, California: University of California Press; Cambridge: University Press. 1941. 152 pp.

This new volume of the University of California Publications presents the mind of Lessing in a more attractive light than its slightly forbidding title would suggest. The author's main thesis is the central importance of the problem of the individual in Lessing's philosophy of life, his chief aim to analyse the clues offered in Lessing's own works to the solution of this problem. He rightly emphasizes the futility of attempts to construct from Lessing's statements a systematic and coherent philosophy: 'Das hiesse schliesslich wirklich den lebendigen Lessing verkennen'

¹ "Psychical distance" as a factor in art and as an Aesthetic principle', in *Brit. J. Psychol.* v, 87 (1912).

(p. 61). And he protests with equal justification against the fashion for explaining so outstanding an individual achievement solely, or even primarily, in the terms of the general development of the age. And if Mr Schmitz seems strangely unaware of evidence adduced by recent research in England into Lessing's indebtedness to many of the critics and writers of that age in Europe, his emphasis on Lessing's own essential independence of mind is none the less just and useful. Lessing's presentation of the individual is analysed in the light of his works, whose central theme is found to be the theme of independence: the human heart has its own laws, the goal of the mind is to know itself. This fundamental idea is traced in Lessing's youthful writings, in the critical and dramatic works of his maturer years, and in particular in the two critical works to which special attention is devoted—*Laokoon* and the *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*. Here Mr Schmitz finds the clearest exposition of Lessing's aesthetic position: his belief in the necessity for both freedom and restraint. One of the most useful elements in his survey is his insistence on Lessing's sense for the actual, on the appeal to individual feeling which was for him, with all his interest in aesthetic principles, the ultimate appeal, and on the immediacy of the connection between art and human beings. The demand for poetic truth is taken as a guiding line to Lessing's scattered observations on the nature of genius, and the strict causality which he demands of a work of art is interpreted less as the demand of a rationalist than as a recognition of the most potent means of appeal to individual feeling: 'Die Anschauung eines abgerundeten, begrenzten Ganzen soll herbeigeführt werden; die Empfindung des Zuschauers muss darum unter allen Umständen erweckt und gehalten . . . werden' (p. 131). This demand for wholeness in a work of art is undoubtedly fundamental to Lessing's position; but it implies surely a very literal interpretation of the 'principle of imitation' to maintain that Lessing abandoned it in favour of emphasis on 'selbstständige Darstellung in der Kunst' (p. 132), and that he sought not imitation but direct representation and 'Verwirklichung' (ibid.). The difference for Lessing might rather be said to lie in differing modes of 'imitation'. A similarly rigid antithesis is suggested in the statement: 'Lessing spielt also das Anschauungsvermögen gegen das Denkvermögen aus' (p. 128) and in its application to his view of art as being concerned with the former capacity (ibid.). But whereas these contrasts seem too sharply defined, there is adequate recognition in the final chapter of the middle way which Lessing took in the matter of aesthetic judgement. He could not accept either of the two extreme positions: axiomatic judgement or unlimited subjectivity. Thus he is seen as holding the balance between these extremes, and heralding the aesthetic ideals characteristic of the age of Weimar.

One of the chief merits of this book is the genuineness of the author's interest in his problem. He is deeply indebted to a certain number of critics who have dealt with Lessing's thought, and makes due acknow-

ledgment of this indebtedness. But while he has followed them to a large extent in the analysis of Lessing's ideas, he has made a picture of Lessing for himself, which gradually emerges from the pages of his book and lends interest to the discussion of his theme.

EDNA PURDIE.

LONDON.

SHORT NOTICES

The new volume of *The Year's Work in English Studies* (Edited by Frederick S. Boas for the English Association. Vol. xx. 1939. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1941. 214 pp. 10s. 6d.) illustrates the problems of editorship in war time, and is a triumph for Dr Boas and his collaborators over circumstances, despite the two checks represented by the postponement of chapters by Professor Wrenn and Dr McIlwraith, which the war has to its credit against Dr Boas. Dr Garmonsway joins the team this year, and in general much devoted work has gone to the maintenance of this record of service over twenty years.

This volume covers a year of minor achievements on the whole, and few works of major importance come under discussion. In this respect Professor de Selincourt's completion of his monumental *Letters of William and Dorothy Wordsworth* stands out. Professor Bullough's admirable *Poems and Dramas of Fulke Greville* is a major work of scholarship, as is Mr Hugh Macdonald's *Dryden: A Bibliography*. Another valuable bibliography is Mr W. T. Davies' *A Bibliography of John Bale*. The fruits of lifelong scholarship appear in the late Dr McKerrow's *Prolegomena for the Oxford Shakespeare*, and Dr Greg's imposing study of *The Variants in the First Quarto of King Lear*. There is critical work of note in Professor Alexander's *Shakespeare's Life and Art*, Professor Carleton Browne's *Religious Lyrics of the Fifteenth Century*, Mr Garrod's *Poetical Works of Keats*, Professor Nethercot's *The Road to Tryermaine*, and Professor Patch's *On Re-reading Chaucer*.

I am bound to add to the list of works of major importance Professor Kittredge's edition of four single plays of Shakespeare, though they are dismissed in two lines in this survey. This seems to be a serious undervaluation. The loss, by Kittredge's death, of his complete commentary on Shakespeare in this projected edition is lamentable and irreparable. He was the perfect commentator upon Shakespeare. I confess also that for myself I find Professor Alexander's unpretentious study of Shakespeare more 'stimulating and arresting' than that of Mr Van Doren (p. 78). On p. 102 and in the Index, 'J. H. Walker' should be 'J. H. Walter'.

C. J. SISSON.

LONDON.

The substance of *The Translations of Lucian by Erasmus and St Thomas More*, by C. R. Thompson (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University. 1940. 52 pp.), which is a revision of part of a doctoral dissertation, has already appeared in the *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*. Nothing in the theme can have warranted republication in a different form, though the author's industry merits a passing word of praise. His account of the fortunes of Lucian on the continent in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, his examination of the chronology of the Greek studies of Erasmus and More; his summary treatment of their translations from Lucian and the lengthier discussion of their renderings of the *Tyrannicida* and of their replies to it in the declamatory form; his remarks on the place of 'declamatio' in humanistic education and on More's fondness and bent for this kind of oratory; all these are interesting enough. But little that is germane to the chief topic emerges from the study beyond a discursive restatement of the obvious fact that the spirit, style, and content of the works of Lucian which Erasmus and More had translated can be seen in the irony of *Moriae Encomium* and *Colloquia* and in the verisimilitude of *Utopia*.

J. F. LOCKWOOD.

LONDON.

Mr Brice Harris claims for his book on *Charles Sackville, Sixth Earl of Dorset* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press. 1940. 269 pp. \$3.50) that it is the first full-length portrait of this Restoration wit and patron, the Eugenius of Dryden's *Essay*, and that he has corrected the date of his birth and some confusions with other Sackvilles. It is intended both as a study of a poet whose meagre output has never been properly edited or estimated (Mr Harris tells us that he has at hand materials for a complete edition of the poems), and as a study of a patron of seventeenth-century literature which shall serve as 'an introduction to a proposed study of patronage in general between 1640 and 1700'. Mr Harris has done useful work in collecting and sifting the material, but it cannot be said that he has achieved a living portrait of the man or his age. He might have done better to let the facts as far as possible speak for themselves, since his commentary, as in the following example, is more conscientious than inspiring: 'Mulgrave's dislike of Dorset is difficult to explain, for their mothers were half sisters.... It may be noted, on the contrary, that relatives are notoriously quarrelsome.' The only error I have noted is a reference (p. 16) to Thomas Fuller as a bishop.

B. A. WRIGHT.

SOUTHAMPTON.

CORRESPONDENCE

SIR,

The following observations may serve to clarify my position as author of books recently reviewed in the *Modern Language Review* (July 1941, pp. 413-14).

Claude Fauchet, sa vie, son œuvre, the *Documents* relating to his life, and the annotated edition of Book I of his *Origine de la Langue* were printed in 1937 and 1938, and published late in 1938, the first review appearing in the *Temps* in February 1939. At that time there was of course no shortage of paper, and printers and publishers were eager for the work.

The two theses—*Vie et œuvre* and the edition—were presented for the French State Doctorate, for which the minimum requirement is *two* books. The actual text of the main thesis is under 400 pages. The subsidiary thesis is an edition of an inaccessible text. It runs to 150 pages, and was sold separately.

At first no book of documents was contemplated, and indeed only passages of importance had been copied, but M. Henri Chamard, who saw some of these, advised their publication, together with *inedita*, etc.—a probable list of the books and manuscripts in Fauchet's famous library, the fragments of the medieval epics he copied from lost manuscripts, a reconstitution of Henri de Mesmes's lost Song-book. The volume was printed in small type.

The price charged for the main thesis (including the *Documents*) was 100 francs, and for the edition, 30 francs, about fifteen or sixteen shillings altogether. This very moderate price was fixed by the publisher without reference to the cost of printing, but with reference to what the *érudits* who frequented the Paris libraries were likely to pay without difficulty for a *livre d'érudition*. The cost of printing was met by money left by Robert Henry Espiner, who had intended publishing a book on Fauchet.

Finally, although I am a graduate of a Scottish university, I have not been a research student either in Scotland or in England.

I am, etc.

JANET ESPINER-SCOTT.

BRORA.

NEW PUBLICATIONS

October—December 1941

With the collaboration of PAMELA GRADON (English)

ROMANCE LANGUAGES

Italian.

PEI, M. A., *The Italian Language*. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 20s.

Spanish.

BOSCH-GIMPERA, P., *Two Celtic Waves in Spain* (Sir John Rhys Memorial Lecture, 1939). London, H. Milford, for the British Academy. 9s. 6d.

TORRES-RIOSECO, A., *Grandes Novelistas de la América Hispana*. California and Cambridge Univ. Presses. \$3.50.

Portuguese.

SACKS, N. P., *The Latinity of Dated Documents in the Portuguese Territory*. Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania Press. \$2.

French.

BARKER, J. E., *Diderot's Treatment of the Christian Religion in 'The Encyclopédie'*. New York, King's Crown Press. \$2.

DU BARTAS, *The Works of*, ed. by U. T. Holmes, Jr., J. C. Lyons and R. W. Linker, Vol. III: *Seconde Sepmaine, Miscellanea*. N. Carolina and Oxford Univ. Presses. 30s.

FEUILLERAT, A., *Baudelaire et la Belle aux Cheveux d'or*. Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 12s.

GARRETT, H. T., *Clothes and Character: The Function of Dress in Balzac*. [Diss.] Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania.

MONTOCRESTIEN, A. DE, *Aman*, ed. by G. O. Seiver. Pennsylvania and Oxford Univ. Presses. 12s.

ROUSSEAU, J.-J., *Discours sur l'origine et les fondements de l'inégalité parmi les hommes*, ed. by F. C. Green. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 5s.

SAUVIGNY, B. DE, *Vashington, ou la liberté du nouveau monde*, ed. by G. Chinard. Princeton and Oxford Univ. Presses. 21s. 6d.

WADE, I. O., *Voltaire and Madame du Châtelet*. Princeton and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s. 6d.

Provençal.

HILL, R. T. and T. G. BERGIN, *Anthology of the Provençal Troubadours* (Yale Romanic Studies xvii). Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 30s.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES

English.

(a) *General (including linguistic)*.

CHURCH, R., *Plato's Mistake*. P.E.N. Books. 2s.

Cornell Studies in English, xxxi. *Methods and Aims in the Study of Literature*. A series of Extracts and Illustrations arranged and adapted by L. Cooper. Cornell and Oxford Univ. Presses. 9s. 6d.

- English Institute Annual 1940, ed. by R. Kirk. Columbia and Oxford Univ. Presses. 13s. 6d.
- Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association, XXVI. Collected by A. Esdaile. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 7s. 6d.
- FOERSTER, N., J. C. MCGALLIARD, R. WELLEK, A. WARREN and W. L. SCHRAMM, Literary Scholarship. Its Aims and Methods. Chapel Hill, Univ. of North Carolina Press. \$3.
- Hermathena: A Series of Papers on Literature, Science and Philosophy. By Members of Trinity College, Dublin. No. LVIII. Dublin, Hodges, Figgis; London, Longmans. 3s.
- SAMUEL, The Rt Hon. Viscount, On Style. The English Association Presidential Address, 1941. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 2s.
- The Year's Work in English Studies, 1939, ed. by F. S. Boas. London, H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press. 10s. 6d.

(b) *Old and Middle English.*

- The Dicts and Sayings of the Philosophers, ed. by C. F. Buhler (Early English Text Society, 211). London, H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press. 30s.

(c) *Modern English.*

- BECKER, M. L., Introducing Charles Dickens. London, Harrap. 10s. 6d.
- BRADNER, L., *Musae Anglicanae: A History of Anglo-Latin Poetry, 1500-1925.* New York, Mod. Lang. Assoc. of America; London, H. Milford. 16s.
- ELIOT, T. S., *The Dry Salvages.* London, Faber and Faber. 1s.
- ELIOT, T. S., *Points of View.* London, Faber and Faber. 3s. 6d.
- HANKINS, J. E., *The Character of 'Hamlet' and other Essays.* North Carolina and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s. 6d.
- HOUSE, H., *The Dickens World.* London, Oxford Univ. Press. 10s. 6d.
- HUXLEY, A., *Grey Eminence.* London, Chatto and Windus. 15s.
- JOHNSON, S., *The Poems of,* ed. by D. Nichol Smith and E. L. McAdam. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 25s.
- KNIGHT, G. W., *The Starlit Dome.* London, Oxford Univ. Press. 16s.
- PASTON, Lady Katherine, *The Correspondence of,* vol. xiv, ed. by R. Hughey. Norfolk Record Society.
- Poems in Latin,* compiled by J. Sparrow. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 6s.
- RICHARDS, G., *Housman, 1897-1936.* London, Oxford Univ. Press. 21s.
- Rochester-Savile Letters, The, 1671-1680,* ed. by J. H. Wilson. Columbus, Ohio State Univ. Press.
- STAUFFER, D. A., *The Art of Biography in Eighteenth-Century England.* In two volumes. Princeton and Oxford Univ. Presses. 51s.
- STEELE, R., *The Correspondence of,* ed. by R. Blanchard. London, H. Milford, Oxford Univ. Press. 35s.
- STOLL, E. E., *Shakespeare and Other Masters.* Harvard and Oxford Univ. Presses. 25s. 6d.
- THALER, A., *Shakespeare and Democracy.* Tennessee and Oxford Univ. Presses. \$2.50.
- WELLEK, R., *The Rise of English Literary History.* North Carolina and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s. 6d.
- WOLFE, D. M., *Milton in the Puritan Revolution.* New York, Nelson. \$4.

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDED 30 SEPTEMBER 1941

(Incorporating the American Transactions for the Year to 8 September 1941)

Dr.	EXPENDITURE	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	INCOME	£	s.	d.	Cr.
1940												
£												
27	To Printing, Stationery, Postages, Travelling Expenses, etc.	22	4	7				By Subscriptions	95			
21	Do. (American Expenses)	26	8	10				General	159			
					48	13	5	American Members				
69	Secretarial Assistance and Audit Fee	68	13	6				" Bibliography	99			
—	Do. (American Expenses)	1	14	6				Sales (vols. I-XIX)		41	8	10
					70	8	0	Advertisements	11		9	2
233	Bibliography							American Sales	75			
	Binding and distribution. Vols. I-XIX (no publication 1941)				7	19	10	" Year's Work in Modern Language Studies				41
	Year's Work in Modern Language Studies							Sales (vols. I-X)	64		24	19
119	Distribution, etc. (Vols. I-X) (no publication 1941)				20	11	1	Advertisements	15		5	0
	Bulletins and Indexes							American Sales	25			
—	Printing				3	11	3	" Bulletins and Indexes				29
	'Work in Progress'—American Advertisement per 1939-1940							Sales	4			19
5	Accounts, refunded							Interest on Bank Deposit	6		5	2
—	Modern Language Review							" 'Work in Progress'				4
	Deficit per Account attached				29	18	3	Modern Language Review				5
88	Surplus for year carried to Balance Sheet				112	11	2	" Surplus per Account attached	9			
1940					£293	13	0					£293
£562									£562			13

BALANCE SHEET 30 SEPTEMBER 1941

AUDITOR'S CERTIFICATE AND REPORT

(Signed) L. SCRIVENER
Incorporated Accountants

NEWCASTLE-UPON-TYNE
8 December 1941.

HEREDIA'S HELLENISM¹

A CRITICAL ESSAY

J.-M. DE HEREDIA had the good fortune, in the early years of the present century, to become as popular outside France as any other modern French poet. His name became as widely known as the decidedly greater names of Baudelaire and Verlaine. This was not because he was lionized by an aesthetic coterie; on the contrary, his direct manner was calculated to repel those with a taste for the esoteric, and his influence on the younger poets has been negligible beside that of Mallarmé. But he was remembered owing to the brilliance, and often perfection, of his form; and he appealed to English readers because he took them into that world of Greek life and legend of which they were citizens by adoption.

There have been other reasons for his fortune. He lived at a time when, if we are to believe M. Julien Benda, men of letters were beginning to abandon their function as clerics, devoted to the service of the spirit, and to write more and more with an eye to the vast, new, half-educated reading public. 'Modern humanity', says M. Benda, 'means to have, in those who call themselves its teachers, not guides but servants; and the majority of them have displayed an admirable grasp of this fact.' To those who still, though obscurely, felt the value of culture, Heredia appealed because he represented the opposite tendency to that of the herd—of M. Benda's 'troupeau laïque'. If books were tending more and more to fall into the two categories of the literature of entertainment and the literature of propaganda—a tendency which the present crisis in the book world has brought clearly to our consciousness—there was still a place for *belles-lettres* and even for the cult of beauty. It is a small place now, if we are to believe the author of *Our Present Discontents*; but it existed in Heredia's time, and he quietly and obstinately occupied it. A certain cultured minority was grateful to him.

In the absence of any general estimate of his position, the time seems to have come to inquire into the legitimacy of his appeal and to assess the quality of that Hellenism on which it mainly rests.

¹ The author and the editor desire to make grateful acknowledgement of the generosity of Mr Arthur Sells which has permitted the publication of this special article.

HEREDIA AND THE CRITICS

Heredia was of course *homo unius libri*; and within the covers of his one *recueil* of *Les Trophées*, the Greek sonnets occupy the place of honour. The interest they have inspired in France is natural enough. It is in French literature and art and in French life, even more than in English or Italian, that the Hellenic tradition is perpetuated in the modern world. In her qualities and faults, in her artistic versatility and intellectual brilliance, in her penchant for democratic adventure, France is the modern Athens. Moreover, the revival of Hellenism in the nineteenth century brought Greek subjects once more into favour with the public; in this matter Heredia was trying his hand at a kind of poetry which went back to Chénier, if not to Ronsard. One might have supposed, for the same reason, that well-informed critics would quickly have determined the value of his Hellenism; one might have supposed that in a field so limited as that occupied by forty-three or forty-four sonnets, on themes which have been studied for centuries by the greatest of European scholars, some measure of agreement would have been found. But, in fact, on turning to the critics, one is perplexed by the discordancy of their verdicts.

For many years, indeed, the dominant note had been one of eulogy. For Brunetière,¹ Heredia 'excelle à rendre le côté "plastique" des belles inventions des Grecs'. When he interprets the myths, the moral or philosophical meaning takes second place; it is as sculptor or painter that the poet treats his subject. 'Le triomphe de M. Heredia, c'est la couleur', declares Brunetière, but, he adds, 'Que pourrait-il y avoir . . . de plus grec,—avec un peu d'alexandrinisme, sans doute, et d'orientalisme mêlés,—mais de plus grec enfin, que ses *Hercule*, ses *Artémis* ou ses *Andromède*?' Thus, in Brunetière's eyes, the taste for colour and mode of treating the myths do not impair the pure Hellenism of these sonnets.

M. Emil Zilliacus went very much further. In an article on Heredia and the Greek Anthology, published in 1910,² he mingled some valuable observations and discoveries of sources with claims which appear hazardous in the extreme.

He begins by noting the affinities between the epigram and the sonnet. Such affinities can obviously be exaggerated. In comparing the epigram, in its bareness and simplicity (and this feature remains constant even in the longer, more profound, deeply poignant epigrams of Leonidas of

¹ The references for this and for other critical judgements summarized in the present essay are contained in the Bibliography at the end.

² *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France*, 1910, pp. 262-70.

Tarentum) with the sonnet, it is well to recall Du Bellay's description of the latter as that 'non moins docte que plaisante invention italienne'. Epigram and sonnet are after all different; and one may question whether the sonnet is the best modern equivalent. Zilliacus traces the originals of a number of sonnets to a French translation of the *Anthologia Palatina*. But his tendency is to discover a large number of sources rather than insist on the essential ones. This appears strikingly in his study of *Le Naufragé*, but is noticeable even in connexion with *Épigramme funéraire*. Heredia's principal sources of inspiration are thus not placed in clear focus. On the other hand, he shows that Heredia certainly used the anonymous translation of the *Anthologia Palatina* which had been issued by Hachette in 1863—a translation due to an able but modest Hellenist named Félix Dehèque. The concluding word of a sonnet is often the word concluding an epigram in this version; moreover, Heredia sometimes uses words and expressions that are found here, although others would be nearer the original. Zilliacus speaks of the 'caractère éminemment plastique et sculptural qu'ont les sonnets grecs et romains'—a view about which a good deal could be said—and concludes his examination of *Épigrammes et Bucoliques* by declaring that more than once Heredia's imagination has given life to the 'often dry and meagre matter' of the Hellenistic poets; and that his sonnets usually contain 'a richer and deeper poetry' than is to be found in their models.

The year of M. Zilliacus's essay saw the appearance of a more sober and scholarly article by Raoul Thauziès.¹ This was a systematic, and in some cases minute, study of the sources of the first fifty-seven sonnets in the *Trophées*. The author concluded that Heredia's general conception of ancient Greece was derived from Louis Ménard, and there is good reason to suppose that he was right.

Finally, in 1911, the value of Heredia's Greek sonnets was considered as a whole by Professor Joseph Vianey.² This critic showed that Heredia drew his knowledge of mythology mainly from Decharme's classic work (*Mythologie de la Grèce antique*, 1879), and he was palpably very much impressed by the poet's learning and by his skill in interpreting the myths. In considering the 'epigrammatic' sonnets, he admits a blemish here and there, but appears to consider Heredia's poems as more interesting and more complete than their models—and more 'synthetic' (which last they doubtless are). The interpretation of Heredia as a word-painter seems to him exaggerated, the poet's true originality lying in

¹ *Revue des Langues romanes*, 1910, pp. 461-512; and 1911, pp. 37-66.

² *Revue des Cours et Conférences*, 1911, pp. 721-35 and 769-84.

the dramatic interest he has imparted to his sonnets. This appears in the dialogue of such poems as *Sphinx*, *Nessus* and *La Centauresse*, but is particularly to be appreciated in the so-called *Épigrammes*. Here, while closely following his models, Heredia has contrived to compose a number of little dramas which are extremely original; he animates pictures which would otherwise be inert; the strokes which come from the painter's brush really assist the action. Thus, little Hellé's grasshopper appears in the environment of his life and of his tomb; and this is only one example of Heredia's care for 'ensembles'. His art is 'singulièrement complexe' and 'l'on sait combien chaque pièce a coûté d'efforts'. Vianey concludes that the admiration which these Greek sonnets 'continue to inspire probably contributes, more than anything else, to maintaining the taste for Hellenic poems in France'. That is true; the popularity of the Greek cycle should in any case be recalled in Heredia's favour.

Dr Miodrag Ibrovac's work on *José-Maria de Heredia*, completed by the same author's subsidiary thesis on *Les Sources des 'Trophées'*, appeared in 1923. A large number of documents and a vast amount of information are here assembled in what is deservedly the standard work on Heredia. Ibrovac is not perhaps primarily interested in Heredia as Hellenist; but he contributes valuably, if indirectly, to our inquiry by showing that the young Creole's first poems had a West Indian setting and were inspired by Musset and by the 'tropical poems' of Leconte de Lisle; further, that Brittany, and especially Brittany as interpreted by the painter Emmanuel Lansyer, preceded Greece as a source of inspiration in Heredia's work: the significance of these facts will be obvious. On the other hand, he describes Heredia's period of study at the École des Chartes, notes his brilliance as a student, and speaks of the École as 'forming his mind' and 'developing his taste for exactitude'. For Ibrovac, Heredia is a serious scholar. In the chapter, or section of a chapter, which he devotes to *La Grèce*, he assembles a good deal of pertinent matter (the bulk of his commentary is reserved for *Les Sources des 'Trophées'*) and his survey is concise and useful; but one misses the firm critical judgements which the subject requires. The writer's taste is not always sure, and few who have any acquaintance with Greek literature would venture the opinion that the hand of Meleager or Archias of Mitylene is 'less firm than Heredia's'. '*Les Trophées*', Ibrovac remarks, 'sont la résurrection de quelques grandes époques du passé, non pas dans le décor immobile et froid d'une galerie de tableaux historiques, mais dans l'atmosphère et le mouvement d'un âge soudain réveillé à nos yeux.' Here we have Heredia

the dramatist (Vianey's Heredia), as distinct from the painter (Brunetière's), or the sculptor (Zilliacus's). Which is the true Heredia?

The author of *Le Génie du Paganisme* (1926) would appear to have decided in favour of the last. Moreover, as a classical scholar, M. Charly Clerc is better qualified to judge than most of Heredia's critics. He considers the poet to have followed partly Leconte de Lisle in his Hellenism, but in a manner of his own. His sonnets make one think of a series of metopes, because, like the sculptures on the friezes of the temples, they fix a number of episodes, or of moments in an episode, in plastic form. He does not treat of the great primitive myths, nor does he give much place to the great figures and events of ancient history. It is perhaps 'the mysterious sea' which plays the principal part in his sonnets. And the *Anthology* is his 'livre de chevet'. Its grace, its sweetness and its melancholy have passed into the *Trophées*; but Heredia can be firmer and more precise than his ancient model. Thus, where one may translate Perses's epigram (VII, no. 539) as follows:

Eupolis et Aristodice, qui t'ont donné le jour, embrassent un tombeau vide et l'inondent de pleurs,

Heredia makes the dead youth say:

C'est ma mère, Étranger, qui sur un vain tombeau
Embrasse une urne vide et l'emplit de ses larmes.

But is Heredia really 'firmer' here than Perses? To the present writer his verses seem no more than a quite acceptable rearrangement. Heredia, as M. Clerc goes on to say, always takes an authentic document as his starting-point but generally contrives to put the seeker off the track. Thus, with reference to his *Andromède*, he cites Apollodorus and Hesiod (of whom the latter did *not* treat of this myth), when his real sources are Ovid and Banville. He borrows for most of his sonnets and borrows widely; his manner is that 'of a scholar and collector'. M. Clerc's verdict is on the whole a favourable one.¹

And thus it will be seen that behind the work of all, or nearly all, these critics lies the assumption that Heredia was a serious scholar, with a remarkable understanding of ancient Greece, and that the quality of his 'Greek' poems is in no way false or factitious.

These findings were to be decisively negated, in general and in detail, by M. Fernand Desonay.

True, M. Pierre Martino may be said to have given the signal for the attack. Writing on Heredia in his little *Parnasse et Symbolisme*, he

¹ The author is indebted to Mlle C.-E. Engel for the kind communication of M. Clerc's criticism, which was not accessible to him at the time.

declares that, in the mythological sonnets, the poet is mainly interested in visual images. The fundamental legends of ancient and prehistoric Greece are lacking in the *Trophées*. Life in the ancient world is seen through the dainty trifles ('mignardises') of the *Anthology*. 'Ce ne sont que petits paysages, petits dieux, petits héros'. One might suppose that disparagement could hardly go further.

But not after reading *Le Rêve hellénique chez les Poètes parnassiens* (1928). In this fine, scholarly work M. Desonay examines the question of Heredia's Hellenism with a knowledge, thoroughness and critical acumen unapproached by any other writer. His chapter on Heredia is a destructive, and in some ways definitive, case for the prosecution; indeed, the Parnassians as a whole emerge with plumage considerably damaged from their encounter with M. Desonay. Not that Louis Ménard or Anatole France have much to fear. Ménard remains the great animator, the true founder of the Parnassian aesthetic: a lonely eagle, too proud and melancholy to claim his due. But Leconte de Lisle is regarded as having grasped only certain external aspects of Hellenism and is described as having 'parfois péniblement répété la leçon péniblement acquise [from Ménard] à la façon d'un perroquet'; while Heredia figures as a dilettante with a taste for loud colours and theatrical effects, or rather (since we are in metaphoric vein), he gives the impression of a jackdaw who delights in collecting odds and ends of glass and tinsel, as gaudy as may be, and then arranging them in patterns and calling them 'trophies'. To speak soberly, he is no true scholar and has no real understanding of the Greek spirit. The plastic sense and the sense of sobriety are absent from the imagination of this Spanish creole. His popularity in Belgium is explained by the fact that his aesthetic appeals to the Flemish conception of 'un art coloriste', a conception brilliantly exemplified in the Flemish painters. But this is very un-Greek. The myths appeal to him, not for their moral or symbolic content, but as pretexts for dramatic word-pictures. The learned allusions which burst on the surface of his sonnets as thick as bubbles on boiling water should not deceive us; not even when we read:

L'Eumolpide vengeur n'a point dans Samothrace
Secoué vers le seuil les longs manteaux sanglants.

They are not integral to the poet's sensibility, but belong to a kind of paste-and-scissors erudition and are assembled as intemperately as the colours that are laid over them. So intemperately indeed that they lead, on occasion, to a gross historical blunder (in *Épigramme votive*). And nothing could be less Greek. Such are M. Desonay's views.

The 'epigrammatic sonnets' have perhaps won Heredia more compliments than the others; and it is true that he had here some of the best models—in M. Dehèque's modest rendering of the *Anthology*. Yet even with these, M. Desonay thinks, he shows his inferiority both as observer and artist. Setting aside particular instances, which are charming, one has only to compare his writing in general with an idyll of Theocritus to see how remote is his bookish and colourful imagination from the sincere, direct vision of the Syracusan.

Heredia's Hellenism consists then, for M. Desonay, of a number of picturesque reminiscences and moral traits worked into a mosaic and presented in dazzling colours; his learning is usually no more than 'a marquetry of mythological names and memories more or less correctly reported'. One should not exaggerate the amount of learning required to understand these sonnets; it is not so vast, nor always so important, after all. His settings are artificial; and he cannot, with safety, move from the beaten track. True, there is an evocative value in 'geographical poetry'; Musset was well aware of the effects which can be drawn from it. And there is an auditive value in certain assemblages of proper names, whether they be names of Cretan monarchs, or Amazons, or Conquistadores; but even these should be used in moderation.

Of the sobriety so constant among the Greeks Heredia is rarely capable. He subdues himself to it on occasion (and more perhaps than M. Desonay here admits); but then his native taste, more imperious than an acquired culture, takes possession of him. And his taste is that of a painter. 'Avouons franchement', concludes Desonay, 'que tout n'est que coloris dans cette cinématographie polychrome des *Trophées*, où chaque vers fait surgir une image nouvelle, suivie immédiatement d'une autre plus éblouissante, jusqu'à la splendide fulguration finale. Rien de moins philosophique, rien de moins grec.'

If this were the last word, a jury of critics would have no choice but to find Heredia wanting—although with a pang for the kind heart he had and the liberal purse ever open to assist a needy *confrère*; for the generous citizen of the Republic of Letters of whom it was said: 'We never heard him belittle or disparage anyone.'¹ And we wonder whether it was his

¹ But he was capable of it. A. Albalat, in *Les Samedis de J.-M. de Heredia*, recalls that the poet used frequently to speak of Auguste Barbier, author of *Les Iambes* and *Il Pianto*, whom he had personally known. He would occasionally repeat some of Barbier's verses. One day, after reciting the sonnet on Michael Angelo, he continued: 'Ce Barbier était l'homme le plus bête que j'aie connu. Il était tellement bête qu'on se demandait comment il avait pu faire de pareils vers. Il est vrai qu'on n'a pas besoin d'être intelligent pour être bon poète.' An anecdote which does not prevent Albalat from remarking mischievously that some of the sonnets of *Il Pianto* (which are indeed rather impressive) may be regarded as the first models of the 'grands sonnets retentissants qui font la gloire des *Trophées*'.

qualities of heart and character, as well as oddities equally endearing, which prevented his friends from pointing out errors in the sonnets which might have been deleted before their collection in *Les Trophées*. We wonder; for he spent nearly thirty years over this work, the sonnets were well known before they were finally revised and collected; and thus, without publishing a single original volume, their author had become, in the words of Lemaître, 'presque inédit et presque célèbre'. We wonder whether his friends took as much interest in the sonnets as we, or whether any one of them was qualified to judge even of their archaeological accuracy. Or did the poet's personality overwhelm them to such an extent that such details seemed unimportant? When one had listened, in some salon of the Faubourg Saint-Germain, to the 'man of the world' declaiming *Antoine et Cléopâtre*; when, not for the first time, one had heard the well-known lines repeated with the familiar mannerism:

...l'ardent Imperator
Vit dans ses larges yeux, étoilés de points d'or,
Toute une mer im-m-m-mense où f-f-fuyaient des galères!

one would have no heart afterwards to discuss, apropos of *Après Cannes*, the topography of Rome or mention the fact that the Sabine Hills are to the east of the city and that even after Cannae—when the Romans were very much disoriented, it is true—they could not possibly have feared to see, appearing on the crest of those hills *in the fiery eye of the sunset*,

Le chef borgne monté sur l'éléphant Gétule.

Still less could one descend to the geography of Hades and remind the amiable author of *Le Laboureur* that Erebus was not, after all, a river. But these reflexions do not diminish the force of Desonay's criticism or the effect it appears to have produced on students of modern literature.

Thus M. Jean Giraud, reviewing *Le Rêve hellénique chez les Poètes parnassiens*, in the *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France* (1932), does not dissent from the author's general conclusions, though he adds, acutely enough: 'C'est à tort que ce critique se refuse à faire de la philologie... Que vaut Leconte de Lisle comme traducteur?... Il y avait mieux à dire... sur l'utilisation des modèles et des documents, sur la stylisation et la couleur locale,—qui n'est souvent que de la couleur'—excellent suggestions, which might also, as we shall see, be applied to Heredia.

M. Desonay's book also received a long and favourable notice, from the pen of M. Pierre Martino, in the *Revue de Littérature comparée* (Avril-Juin, 1930). M. Martino, it is true, judges that Desonay's conception of Hellenism is too narrow and suggests that the Hellenic element is not the principal part of it. For Desonay the Greek notion of beauty is of

something young and pleasant, 'adorned with soft Ionian grace'; and this is obviously an imperfect conception. It explains, however, Desonay's enthusiastic preference for Anatole France. In coming to Heredia, M. Martino, as we should expect, does not fundamentally differ with M. Desonay. He observes that Heredia's ambitions were very limited, but judges none the less that 'les durs jugements de M. Desonay nous avertissent des sévérités prochaines de la postérité'.

One may notice, however, that these 'sévérités' had not appeared in M. M. Souriau's *Histoire du Parnasse* (1929), although but little space is here accorded to our poet; nor even in M. Henri Peyre's *Louis Ménard* (1932)—which is curious, for M. Peyre is probably the leading authority on French Hellenism in the nineteenth century. He considers that Heredia's borrowing from Ménard, in matters of detail, has been exaggerated; but agrees with Vianey that he owed him something essential: his interest in Greece. Ménard's subtle mysticism would make no appeal to Heredia. On the other hand, Heredia 'a... senti et rendu la majesté de la Grèce primitive; il a discrètement indiqué dans quelques sonnets le sens physique de ses mythes'. The judgement, though brief, gives a very different impression from Desonay's; but if, in recent years, attention has rather concentrated on personal reminiscences of the poet or on the study of his style, which has been the subject of a German dissertation, this, we may suppose, is because few have been willing to challenge the redoubtable authority of MM. Desonay and Martino; and also because, owing to the growing cleavage between modern and classical studies, few have probably felt qualified to judge.

And here we may notice a great evil which is likely more and more to vitiate our enjoyment of literature. Without some knowledge of Greek, and of the Greek world, the full enjoyment of such poets as Ronsard and Chénier will be missed, as it is constantly missed. Few critics to-day, in any country, possess the equipment of a Matthew Arnold, whose Hellenic culture—so deep as to give the impression of being integral—and whose knowledge of certain of the greater Italian poets, impart to his criticism of French and English writers the quality of a true Humanism.

It will be seen, however, that, in the absence of a Matthew Arnold or a Sainte-Beuve, there is a sharp division of opinion among the critics. For some of them, Heredia is a scholar, a good Hellenist, possessing that plastic sense which was perhaps the master faculty of the Greek artist, and with it a feeling for the underlying sense of the myths of Polytheism; for others, an amateur, a 'nouveau-riche', with a 'South-American temperament' and a penchant for crude colouring; whose

pictures of Greek life are marred by lack of taste and inadequate knowledge. But while Heredia's admirers are silent or hesitant, his detractors appear to be confident in their severity. In the absence of any serious study, subsequent to Desonay's, on Heredia's Hellenism, the detractors may be said to hold the field. The present writer would not have reopened the *dossier* of the Heredia case, if he had not thought that a judgement more generous than theirs was also more equitable.

THE 'CAS HEREDIA'

The problem is, of course, more subtle than the majority of critics will allow. One cannot turn the pages of the books and articles reviewed without feeling that again and again the issue has been evaded or ignored. Desonay has indeed faced the problem with the knowledge and taste it requires; but how many of his fellows have any true acquaintance with the Hellenistic poets, who are, nevertheless, easily dismissed as 'les petits poètes de l'hellénisme finissant' and their epigrams characterized as 'mignardises'? Yet an acquaintance with the work of even one, such as Leonidas of Tarentum, would render such misconceptions impossible, and might even lead to harder judgements on Heredia; for no well-informed critic would set him on quite the same level as Leonidas. But the question is more than one of the critic's knowledge. We have to decide what we are expecting of the modern poet who speaks of the Greek world. Do we ask of him a kind of restoration of Greek poetry, such as Matthew Arnold attempted in his fragments of an *Antigone* and a *Dejaneira*, and in *Merope*? Or do we ask him to interpret ancient Greece, faithfully but in modern terms, that is, with a modern sensibility (for style and sensibility are one), much as Keats interprets it? The method of restoration and the method of interpretation are the two kinds of Hellenism which seem to us acceptable; and Arnold and Keats, who are their best exponents, might serve as touchstones in judging the quality of Heredia's Hellenism. For when all matters of fact have been settled, the critic must still pronounce a judgement. What is the quality of Heredia's Greek sonnets? Wherein lies their excellence?

We might begin by asking how and when Heredia acquired his enthusiasm for ancient Greece. The majority of us come to this strong and passionate interest in the Greek world between the ages of sixteen and eighteen, and rarely lose it. Did anything like this take place in Heredia's boyhood?

Over this question Desonay passes rapidly, so rapidly that the reader hardly remembers that much of the evidence has been ignored. Yet

what we do know is significant. The young Heredia, established in Senlis under the friendly eye of M. Fauvelle, his late father's correspondent, had the signal advantage of being educated in an ecclesiastical establishment, in which the humanities had a place of honour. At the Collège de Saint-Vincent at Senlis, founded by Mgr Gignoux, Bishop of Beauvais, and directed by the fathers of the diocese of Beauvais, Noyon and Senlis, Heredia displayed a special aptitude for the classics. In 1856 he was awarded the first prize for Greek translation and the third *accessit* for Greek composition.¹ He took pleasure in later years in paying homage to his old masters; though one looks in vain for any precise evidence that he owed them that enthusiasm for ancient Greece which inspires so large a part of the *Trophées*. It cannot, however, be denied that they initiated him into the language.

In 1858 he returned to his home in Cuba, he studied in Havana and perfected his knowledge of Spanish; in 1861 his mother brought him back to France and made a home for him in the Rue de Tournon in Paris; in November 1862, he entered the École des Chartes.

The École des Chartes was designed primarily to train specialists in French palaeography and in the various branches of French medieval historical research: it was a school for archivists and librarians; it was not a school of Hellenism. Heredia's true understanding of Greece, his regret for that 'divine civilization which lies buried under the ruins of the temples', he acquired in a little room above a bookseller's shop in the Place de la Sorbonne; and he acquired it, on his own showing, from the 'mystic pagan', Louis Ménard. Here again M. Desonay, who dwells with some relish on Heredia's studies at the École des Chartes, becomes somewhat reticent.

THE PARNASSIAN GROUP

Heredia was collaborating at this time with a number of young poets who were to become members of the first Parnassian group. For many years, before the appearance of M. Henri Peyre's book, there was a tendency to regard the Parnassians as forming a scholarly, neo-Hellenist school which drew its inspiration from the powerful, if hidden flame of Louis Ménard's genius.² But the Parnassians were not as a whole the men of profound learning and exact scholarship that one imagined. With the possible exception of Leconte de Lisle, Sully Prudhomme alone could claim recognition under this head, and his learning was scientific. More-

¹ M. Ibrowac, *J.-M. de Heredia*, pp. 21-3.

² See H. Peyre, *Louis Ménard*, 1932, p. 343.

over, as M. Peyre believes, the influence of Ménard on the Parnassians was wide but probably not very considerable. The vogue of Hellenism was not an invention of his; it formed part of the Romantic movement. The real bond of union between the poets who contributed to *Le Parnasse Contemporain* was not any Hellenism, but a kind of 'romantisme mitigé'; they were *aiming* at what Arnold had recommended: a Romanticism informed by knowledge, by criticism; which is not to say that they always attained it. For M. Desonay the Hellenism of most of the Parnassians was purely external or superficial. Greece appeared to them in the guise of marble temples, processions of youths and maidens, hoplites with crimson plumes. Most of them might have confessed with Leconte de Lisle, in a moment of candour and disillusionment:

Et nous avons perdu le chemin de Paros.

Critics do not seem to have been impressed with the fact that few, if any, of these poets were able to visit Greece, or even Magna Graecia or Sicily. The value of such travel can perhaps be exaggerated; the barbarian may be unmoved in the presence of the greatest masterpieces. But to anyone with a feeling for art, a glimpse of one great classical site is usually overwhelming. When Goethe came to Paestum, he received the impression of a new world.

LOUIS MÉNARD

If Louis Ménard, after visiting Alexandria, avoided going to Greece, it was perhaps because he dreaded the modern appearance of a country which was for him a land of dream and legend.¹ He was a Hellenist rather than a Hellene, happy only among Greek books and dwelling imaginatively in the land of the Gods. 'Quand l'avenir n'a plus de promesses', he writes, 'l'esprit se nourrit de souvenirs, et, pour les races fatiguées, la société des morts vaut mieux que celle des vivants.' For many years his greatness was divined rather than understood. He has been generally described as the centre of a kind of magic influence which radiated over his disciples. Now, thanks to M. Peyre's investigation, he can be appreciated more exactly.

His work as scholar and historian is principally associated with the interpretation of Greek Polytheism. It was in the study of Polytheism and its social consequences that he made such a brilliant début, in 1859, with his two theses for the doctorate. The ideas contained in these books

¹ See *Lettres inédites de Louis Ménard*, ed. H. Peyre, 1932, p. 11.

were developed and supplemented in *Du Polythéisme hellénique* in 1863; and Greek mythology still supplied the leading inspiration for that fullest expression of his thought, the *Réveries d'un païen mystique*. It was the great effort of his life to explain how such an apparently naive mythology could have been devised, and accepted, by a people so enlightened. Rejecting the rationalistic explanation of Euhemerus and the philological explanation associated with the name of Max Müller, Ménard went back to the symbolical method devised by Epicharmus and Metrodorus, developed by the Stoics, and represented in modern times by Creuzer, Guigniaut and Otfried Müller. He modified and developed it; and while not exactly devising anything new, he went further than others by virtue of the poetry of his style, in fact by his *sensibility*—the sincere piety which he felt for all the gods. It was natural that he should be opposed in some measure to the Euhemerist Renan (there is piquancy in M. Peyre's picture of the neo-pagan Ménard defending the divinity of Christ against the ex-seminarist of Tréguier), and violently to Max Müller. His comment on the philological explanation of Greek mythology is worth recalling here. He held that to regard mythology as a malady of language,

c'est à peu près comme si on disait que la fleur est une maladie de la plante. Encore faudrait-il admettre que le langage a donné naissance à la mythologie, ce que, pour ma part, je suis loin d'accorder... Il y a, dans les formes vivantes que donne à la religion le génie créateur des époques primitives, quelque chose de plus sérieux qu'une collection de rébus ou de calembours.

It is possible that Ménard's religious syncretism was not derived solely from Creuzer and the French and German scholars who followed him; he probably owed the feeling of it, in part, to the painter Chenavard, whose misty, symbolical pictures represented the vast company of divine beings who, in various ages, have sustained and given hope to the human spirit.

This was the man with whom the young Heredia read Greek and discussed the civilizations of the past, very much in the manner of an English undergraduate reading and discussing problems with his supervisor. Forty years later he communicated his memories of these days to M. Édouard Champion, who was then engaged in drawing up a sheaf of reminiscences in honour of *Le Tombeau de Louis Ménard*. These memories bear the stamp of authenticity. After mentioning that, for him and Leconte de Lisle, Ménard understood 'the language of the Hellenes' better than any other Frenchman, he said that it was in response to Ménard's invitation that he used to go two or three times a week to his flat in the Place de la Sorbonne. No difficulty in the text could stop Ménard.

La vue seule des caractères grecs le transportait de joie; à la lecture il était visible qu'il s'animait intérieurement; au commentaire c'était un enthousiasme. Sa face noble s'illuminait.¹

Observing that Ménard was by no means the kind of theorist or professor needed to group disciples around him and form a literary school, he went on to say:

Son influence sur nous autres Parnassiens se marqua en ce qu'il nous donna la compréhension générale, l'amour et le regret de cette divine civilisation ensevelie sous les ruines des temples.

It was hardly necessary to add that neither Banville nor Leconte de Lisle had such true visions of antiquity as Ménard.

La Grèce de Louis Ménard fut plus vivante, plus humaine, plus active—et ceci encore atteste sa prépondérance et nous prouverait qu'en restant le plus éclairé, il fut aussi l'initiateur.²

These statements are clear and decisive enough; it is only of secondary interest to learn that Ménard enlightened his young disciple on many points in pagan antiquity. 'Sans lui, assurément', says Heredia, 'je n'aurais pas écrit les *Centaures* et je n'aurais peut-être jamais eu cette conception.'

It was probably in 1863 or 1864, M. Peyre thinks, that these informal lessons were given. 'Ménardos' was then at the height of his activity as Hellenist; and it is significant that while he was already the 'pagan', he was not yet quite the 'mystic'. In 1859 he had defended in the Sorbonne his two theses: *De sacra poesi Graecorum* and *De la Morale avant les Philosophes*; he had continued his studies, and in 1863, as we have seen, had published a larger volume incorporating most of the thesis in Latin and entitled *Du Polythéisme hellénique*. This is, from whatever side one takes it, a brilliant work; solidly founded on a first-hand knowledge of the texts and of the best recent criticism, it contains pages of interpretation and commentary which are truly inspired. It is because none of Heredia's critics has seen the significance of this work's appearing at the very time when Heredia was reading Greek with its author; and also because we believe that Heredia owed him at least as much as he declares and more than most recent critics will allow, that we think it worth while opening these neglected pages. We may at least glean from them some idea of the lessons which the young Heredia received.

Du Polythéisme hellénique is a study of the religion of ancient Greece³ interpreted by means of symbolism. The guiding principle of this religion was 'the idea of Law, that is of order, proportion and harmony', and its

¹ *Le Tombeau de Louis Ménard*, 1902, pp. 24-5.

² *Ibid.*, p. 29.

³ For a recent treatment of the subject, cf. Thaddeus Zieliński, *The Religion of Ancient Greece*, translated by G. R. Noyes. Oxford, 1926.

deities were thus 'living Laws'. It was the outcome of a republican conception of the universe. The human forms which the Greek imagination conferred upon the gods were, so to speak, imposed by the nature of the human conscience. As man finds

dans la forme humaine le type divin de la beauté, dans la conscience humaine l'idéal divin de la justice, c'est lui-même qu'il prend pour modèle quand il veut traduire les lois divines dans la langue symbolique de la poésie et de l'art, qui est la langue naturelle de la religion. Aussi Hésiode dit-il que les Dieux et les hommes sont de la même famille.

The order and harmony of the world spring from the voluntary submission of autonomous forces. Consequent upon these conceptions are the constitution of the republican city-state, the most perfect political form yet devised,¹ and the cult of beauty which is the principle of Greek art. In *De la Morale avant les Philosophes*, Ménard had studied the social consequences of Polytheism: it led naturally to a republican ethic, 'et c'est ce qui explique pourquoi la Grèce perdit sa liberté en même temps qu'elle abandonna ses Dieux'. In the present volume he studies the expression it found in literature and art, its manifestations in the oracles and mysteries, and its relations with the East and with the Philosophers. Briefly, the whole of Greek civilization is an outcome and an expression of Polytheism; but the highest glory of the Hellenes is to be found in their spontaneous, persistent response to the most poignant question of the heart. 'Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return', said the early Hebrews. But while they and others responded to this question with hesitation or demal, in the long night of history

la Grèce rayonne comme un phare. . . on peut le dire à l'éternel honneur de l'Hellénisme, il n'est pas de religion qui ait affirmé plus haut et plus clairement l'immortalité de l'âme.²

The book is full also of brilliant and penetrating observations. Ménard's interpretation of Hermes as a symbol of twilight, if one can so express what to the Greeks was a divine mystery, appears to have been original at the time. His mother symbolizes Night rather than Earth; there is an Orphic fragment in which Zeus calls the night Maia; and in the

¹ Ménard's view.—The ancient city-states were in the first instance monarchical. The republics arose out of the triumph of the aristocracies, and their survival was usually dependent on the strength and duration of these aristocracies. Both before and after the so-called Golden Age (which was extremely 'agitated'), many of the cities were oscillating uneasily between democracy and tyranny, and a state of crisis, from one reason or another, appears in many to have been almost endemic. The failure of the Greek cities to form any kind of lasting federation led to the misfortunes which befell the western Greeks at the hands of Lucanians and Carthaginians, and finally to the political subjection of Greece proper.

² *Du Polythéisme hellénique*, 1863, p. 381.

Homeric Hymn she is a daughter of Atlas, who dwells among the Hesperides in the home of the twilight. As to her son, writes Ménard,

Dès que le soleil est couché, l'enfant nouveau-né chasse les vaches des Dieux, allume le feu, prépare le souper, rentre tard à la maison et, ôtant ses sandales, s'enveloppe dans ses couvertures et s'endort aux rayons de la lune. Comment ne pas reconnaître là un tableau du crépuscule, les troupeaux ramenés à l'étable, le souper, le sommeil...?

But the greatness of Ménard's work probably lies less in the ideas than in his vivid and poetical perception of their truth.

Cependant, alors même que les lumières du ciel diminueaient, que les vertus et les croyances tombaient comme des feuilles mortes, le sol de la Grèce ne pouvait être stérile, il lui fallait ses fruits d'automne.¹

Could one give a better or a more rapid impression of the Hellenistic age? The historian sees here with the eyes of the poet. Speaking later of the abandonment of the gods, he says:

Cependant il doit y avoir un terme à toute chose, même à l'ingratitude des hommes. Un jour viendra où la religion qui a fait la Grèce si grande sera jugée selon ses œuvres. Elle a passé vite, comme la beauté, comme le printemps, comme le bonheur, mais elle a créé la civilisation grecque, et on ôterait plutôt le soleil du ciel que la Grèce de l'histoire.²

Whatever this book may be, it is clearly not one of the popular manuals, furnished with a good index, which Romantics and Parnassians used for their local colour. The philosophic tone and habit of generalization were not such as to appeal to a poet with a taste for concrete detail; and in fact, the principal authorities are unwilling to admit that it exercised a fundamental influence on Heredia. It is 'excessive' in Ibrovac's opinion to pretend that one cannot understand the *Trophées* without it.

MÉNARD'S INFLUENCE ON HEREDIA

To test the validity of these views, we may open the *Trophées* at a sonnet which has been neglected by the commentators and for which Ibrovac himself, in his extremely detailed *Sources des 'Trophées'*, finds no originals, apart from Hugo and Ronsard.

Funérailles

Vers la Phocide illustre, aux temples que domine
La rocheuse Pytho toujours ceinte d'éclairs,
Quand les guerriers anciens descendaient aux enfers,
La Grèce accompagnait leur image divine.
Et leurs Ombres, tandis que la nuit illumine
L'Archipel radieux et les golfes déserts,
Écoutaient, du sommet des promontoires clairs,
Chanter sur leurs tombeaux la mer de Salamine...

Du Polythéisme hellénique, 1863, p. 194.

² *Ibid.*, p. 392.

One is curious to know why this idea of the immortality of the soul—of the souls of the 'divine ancestors'—should be associated by the poet with a picture of Delphi; and why the scene should then move from the sanctuary overlooking the Gulf of Corinth to the 'bright headlands' of Attica and the 'sea of Salamis' and the sun-lit Cyclades. The description is general, but the mention of Salamis evokes the heroic period of the Persian Wars, between Marathon (490 B.C.) and the victories at Salamis (480 B.C.) and Plataea (478 B.C.). But we have only to consult *Du Polythéisme hellénique* to find the answer. After showing how much more hopeful was the religious intuition of the Greek than that of the early Hebrew, Ménard observes:

Tandis que les patriarches bibliques s'endorment à côté de leurs pères, *les héros grecs conservent au delà du tombeau une vie indépendante*. Le peuple, dans ses prières, les confond presque avec les Dieux, et leurs tombes sont sacrées comme des temples. Ils sont les gardiens vigilants des cités, . . . *les hôtes invincibles de toutes les fêtes*, les auxiliaires puissants de leurs fils aux jours des batailles . . .

Heredia would read in Ménard's book (if he needed to learn it) that 'Pytho était la capitale des Amphictyons, le centre religieux et politique de la Grèce', besides finding a further reference to Apollo's sanctuary 'dans la rocheuse Pytho'.¹ He would doubtless learn from Ménard himself that the sacred groves under the Phedriades were crowded with temples.

As the shades of Heredia's warriors are listening to the sea of Salamis, they are probably fellow-fighters under Themistocles, whose tactics in the battle had met with such success. The connexion with Pytho is equally clear. Heredia may well have learned that after Marathon, ten years earlier, the Athenians had dedicated at Delphi the little temple known as the Athenian Treasury, which stands by the Sacred Way as one mounts to the great sanctuary of Apollo. But he could in any case learn from Ménard's chapter on the Oracles and Mysteries how, at the time of the second great invasion, under Xerxes (481-480 B.C.), the Athenians who had sent to consult the Pythian Apollo were answered by predictions which threatened the worst:

Pallas has not been able to soften the lord of Olympus,
Though she has often prayed him, and urged him with excellent counsel.

In reply to renewed instances, however, the priestess was induced to say at last:

Then far-seeing Zeus grants this to the prayers of Athena:
Safe shall the wooden walls continue for thee and thy children.²

¹ The expression was traditional.

² Herodotus, VII, 141. Trans. Rawlinson.

'The wooden walls' were of course the Athenian fleet which overcame the Persian Armada at Salamis. It is hardly necessary to add that the year 478 saw the allied victory at Plataea, after which Spartans and Athenians set up the great serpent-column at Delphi and dedicated a tenth of their booty to the god. Even without this further evidence of the close relations between Delphi and Attica at the time of the Persian invasion, *Du Polythéisme hellénique* contains enough, as we have shown, to explain the opening quatrains of *Funérailles*. As Heredia was taking lessons from Ménard towards 1863—the year in which Ménard's book appeared—and as the sonnet *Vœu*, which gives a foretaste of *Funérailles*, dates from the same year (*Funérailles* itself belongs to 1868), we may conclude that Heredia was more familiar with Ménard's book than has yet been allowed.

The demonstration might be pursued for others of the Greek sonnets (*Funérailles* is not included in *La Grèce et la Sicile*), such as *La Naissance d'Aphrodité*, which is inspired by Ménard's chapter on 'La Théogonie d'Hésiode' and largely made up of words and phrases which are to be found there¹; or in *À Hermès Criophore*, the opening quatrain of which is based on a passage in Ménard's description of the god of flocks and herds. One might also recall Heredia's statement that but for Ménard he would not have written *Les Centaures* (by which he probably meant both *Centaures et Lapithes* and *Fuite des Centaures*); but such borrowings are not very important. What is truly significant is that the general feeling arising from the Greek sonnets, not only the mythological ones but also those inspired by the *Anthology*, a feeling of adoration in the presence of so much beauty, of melancholy and regret for its passing, a desire also to rescue something of it from oblivion (*L'Oubli*, *Médaille antique*), is also the keynote of *Du Polythéisme hellénique*.

Heredia would not appear to have considered this modern world as an object worthy of our interest or affection. Not that he ever formulates the idea, but he must have felt it through his association with Leconte de Lisle whose anathemas struck and burned like vitriol. And he must have agreed with the gentler Ménard, who had concluded his book on Polytheism by observing quietly that 'la société des morts vaut mieux que celle des vivants'.

It is the dead who deserve our love. If Heredia had not felt this he could no more have composed the *Trophées* than Ménard could have written *Du Polythéisme hellénique*. For it is by art that we maintain the cult of the dead. Thus, it is a function of art to bring back to life what

¹ See R. Thauziès, art. cit.

has once been dear, or to perpetuate its life. This is the meaning of the sculptured reliefs on the tombs, and also of the numerous sepulchral epigrams in the *Anthology*. If one studies the tombs from the Ceramicus Cemetery in Athens, of which a large number survive from the end of the fifth and from the fourth century B.C., one sees that the man or woman is represented alive, conversing with members of the family. The scene may be familiar or, as more often, represent the parting, even so the central figure is seated or standing. The Greeks were not, like our medieval ancestors, haunted by the idea of death and corruption. They did not represent their dead lying prone with closed eyes, because they did not think of them as dead. They desired to honour and perpetuate their memory by representing them alive, in all the beauty which art could confer. And it is the same with the sepulchral epigrams. Though these contain a lament for the dead, and often a bitter cry, a part of the poem may be devoted to celebrating his beauty, his joy in life, his virtues and even his follies. These epigrams are not 'mignardises', nor were they for the most part composed by 'les petits poètes de l'Hellénisme finissant'; but perceptions of a grief which often seems incurable, translated into poetry by some of the most perfect artists who have ever lived.

But art does more than this. It not only perpetuates the joy of life, but when life is ugly it offers an escape into dream. Similarly from the modern world which is ugly and mediocre, Hellenism offers an escape into a world so beautiful that, remote as it is, it yet helps to sustain the soul.

These are the perceptions implicit in Heredia's Greek sonnets, and nowhere more than in the beautiful poem which opens the *recueil*—of all French poems perhaps the best known to English readers.

L'Oubli

Le temple est en ruine au haut du promontoire
Et la Mort a mêlé, dans ce fauve terrain,
Les Déesses de marbre et les Héros d'airain
Dont l'herbe solitaire ensevelit la gloire.

Seul, parfois, un bouvier menant ses buffles boire,
De sa conque où soupire un antique refrain
Emplissant le ciel calme et l'horizon marin,
Sur l'azur infini dresse sa forme noire.

La Terre maternelle et douce aux anciens Dieux
Fait à chaque printemps, vainement éloquente,
Au chapiteau brisé verdir une autre acanthe;

Mais l'Homme indifférent au rêve des aïeux
Écoute sans frémir, du fond des nuits sereines,
La Mer qui se lamente en pleurant les Sirènes.

Scholars have been tempted to trace the origin of this picture to Louis Ménard's description of the destruction of the temples and the statues.¹ But what is significant here is not the repetition of words—almost inevitable when the same subject is treated—but the similarity of feeling; and this similarity extends from the passage in question to the whole of *Du Polythéisme hellénique*. For it is a book written from an intensely personal standpoint and animated by the same feelings from beginning to end. 'Il nous donna l'amour et le regret de cette divine civilisation ensevelië sous les ruines des temples': in these words Heredia acknowledges and explains the sentiment underlying this opening poem.

It would be interesting to discover what ruin, if any, Heredia had in mind. Was it the temple of Aphaia on Ægina, or the temple of Poseidon at Sunium? M. Thauziès suggests that the poet might have read the opening lines of Pausanias's description of Greece in which he speaks of the promontory, the little roadstead and the temple dedicated to the Sunian Athena. This, however, stood on the ridge behind the promontory, and little more than the foundations remain. The real landmark, the splendid temple which still crowns the headland, was dedicated to Poseidon. But the difficulty about these otherwise plausible conjectures is that buffaloes do not graze on the cliffs of Attica.

They are, on the other hand, numerous in southern Italy and have probably always been found in Sicily. The first draft of *L'Oubli* appeared under the title *En Campanie*—a title perhaps suggested by a Latin poem of Sannazaro's, *In Theatrum Campanum*:

Scilicet, heu, fati leges, rapit omnia tempus,
Et que sustulerat, deprimit ipsa dies....

Gabriel Hanotaux records that on one occasion, when Sannazaro's name was mentioned, Heredia exclaimed: 'Ah! oui, je le connais, celui-là; il a pris quelques vers à mes sonnets.'² But there is more in this than meets the eye. According to one who knew Heredia personally, the poet imagined that in a previous existence he had been Sannazaro himself.³ Sannazaro, it will be recalled, was also of Spanish origin. This

¹ 'Le silence et l'oubli s'étendent sur [les chefs-d'œuvre de la pensée humaine] comme la neige sur les feuilles mortes; nul ne sait au juste comment disparurent le Zeus d'Olympie et l'Athène du Parthénon. La destruction des temples passe inaperçue au milieu de l'indifférence de l'histoire.... Pour un peuple qui a renié ses traditions, les témoignages de la pitié, de l'héroïsme et du génie des *anciens* sont des *remords* visibles dont la présence importune. Les souvenirs du passé disparaissent sans qu'un regret les accompagne. Les statues d'or et d'argent furent fondues... quant aux marbres, on se contenta d'abord de les briser pour effacer les traces d'un culte proscrit.'

² Ibrovac, op. cit., p. 313.

³ I am indebted for this information, not generally known, to the kindness of Professor Paul Hazard.

belief of his in metempsychosis opens up interesting possibilities. Pythagoras taught that the intervals between our successive reincarnations in *human* form are periods of exactly two hundred and sixteen years. Now as Sannazaro died in 1530 while Heredia was born in 1842—three hundred and twelve years later—it would appear that if he thought he had been Sannazaro, he was no orthodox Pythagorean. But it is conceivable, even probable, that, though he had not studied the doctrine in detail, he yet believed he had once stood on the Campanian shore, by the Tyrrhenian Sea, on a day which he had long forgotten and by ruins which themselves seemed like a symbol of oblivion. But again—unfortunately for our conjecture—there is no temple site in Campania like the one in the poem.

The coasts of Campania and Basilicata would seem to be indicated by the last line of the sonnet, for they were, from Naples to the headland south of Paestum, the favourite home of the Sirens. The acanthus makes one think of Paestum and so do the buffaloes which may be seen grazing round the walls of the city. But at Paestum the temples stand on the plain, a mile or more from the sea. There is, however, one site on Italian soil which almost fulfils the conditions: that of the temple of the Argive Hera, on the Lacinian promontory, overlooking the Ionian Sea. It was perhaps the most ancient Greek temple in Italy and was revered throughout the Graeco-Roman world. We read that the pine grove which once surrounded it contained statues of the men of Croton who had been victors in the athletic contests of their day; and we are tempted to suppose that these were the poet's 'héros d'airain'. Unfortunately, the first draft of the sonnet reads:

Le temple est renversé sur le haut promontoire,
Et la mort a mêlé dans ce fauve terrain
Les déesses de marbre et les *tritons* d'airain—

and in changing 'tritons' to 'héros', the poet was almost certainly moved by considerations of style. Moreover, of the Argive Heraion only one column remains; the impression of the site is of something far more fragmentary, far more desolate than anything in Heredia's poem.

Nor are we luckier in turning to Sicily. At Agrigento, the only possible site, the temples stand for the most part on the crest of a high bluff, at some distance above the sea. The ruins of the temple called the temple of 'Juno Lacinia' convey a feeling similar to that of Heredia's poem and, as viewed from some way down the rocky slope, might give the impression of standing on a headland.¹ The situation of this temple is

¹ I have been greatly assisted, in this attempt to establish the site of *L'Oubli*, by the expert knowledge of Mr C. T. Seltman.

magnificent. Heredia may have seen a drawing of it or of one of the other sanctuaries which rose 'above the banks where the sheep feed beside the stream of Akragas', as Pindar describes them in the twelfth Pythian Ode. It is equally possible that his temple was an imaginary one. Imaginary or real, it must, as we have seen, be placed in Italy or Sicily; and this perhaps accounts for the title he gave to the Greek sonnets as a whole: *La Grèce et la Sicile*.

THE QUESTION OF HEREDIA'S SCHOLARSHIP

L'Oubli well deserves its position as an introductory piece; yet the group of sonnets which follows it was by no means the first to be composed. Heredia's early poems were written for the most part under the inspiration of Breton coast scenery and of the painter Emmanuel Lansyer, whom the poet and his family used to meet at Douarnenez during their summer holidays. There is also a more lyrical vein in these early sonnets than usually appears in the poems written after 1880. When Heredia begins to write on mythological themes we frequently find that his inspiration has been kindled either by a contemporary painting or by some recent poem of Banville's. Now Banville was essentially, as Thibaudet describes him, a *décorateur*. Such models suggest that Heredia's master faculty was not so much a sense of the past as a gift for pictorial representation; all of which does not point to any very true Hellenism or any very deep scholarship.

'Érudition sommairement livresque', declares Desonay, 'à propos de laquelle je prononcerais volontiers le mot de "placage"'. One may begin by considering the arrangement of the sonnets. To Desonay it appears artificial, as though the poet had found a serious difficulty in adopting any plan for grouping a number of poems composed at different times and in different moods. Desonay begins by questioning the propriety of the title. Why '*La Grèce et la Sicile*'? Consider the scenes of the various poems: *Némée*, near Tiryns, in Argolis; *Stymphale*, in Arcadia; *Centaurès et Lapithes*, in Thessaly; *Jason et Médée*, in Colchis; *Le Thermodon*, in Cappadocia; *Artémis*, on the isle of Ortygia, off the coast of Asia Minor; *Ariane*, on Naxos; *Le Réveil d'un Dieu*, in Phoenicia; *Les Bergers*, in Arcadia, and so on. Not one of the scenes is laid in Sicily. In *L'Esclave* Sicily is described, but is not the scene of the poem. In *À Hermès Criophore*, the Galaesus is near Tarentum, but that is not Sicily. On the other hand, several of the sonnets are Asiatic, either in spirit or geographically, and Heredia might just as well, on this view, have adopted as his title *La Grèce et l'Asie*.

To these objections it may be answered that Heredia was not thinking of the geography, but of the spirit of his poems, and that in writing a number of sonnets on pastoral themes, on the milder aspects of country life, shepherds and grasshoppers, he was introducing something of the idyllic note; and that it was therefore proper to speak of Sicily, the home of the idyll, the country whose sloping meadows and sunny air and dazzling sea had inspired the idylls of Theocritus and Moschus; and that 'La Sicile' is simply an invocation to the 'Sicelides Musae', to whom Virgil himself had appealed. But to this M. Desonay retorts that the quiet, limpid tone of the idyll was entirely foreign to Heredia's temperament. The truth is, in Desonay's view, that our poet loved well-sounding titles, if possible in pairs. He had 'Hercule et les Centaures', 'Artémis et les Nymphes', 'Épigrammes et Bucoliques'; and, for his larger divisions, 'Rome et les Barbares', 'L'Orient et les Tropiques'. Something was needed to go with 'La Grèce', and 'La Sicile' served the purpose, because it was poetical.

This criticism is weighty indeed, though it might be excessive to take it as a ground for denying Heredia any title to scholarship. In thinking of ancient Greece he probably thought of the Hellenic world as a whole; he thought of Hellas and Ionia; and, on the other hand, of Hellas and Magna Graecia and Sicily, as a single world of legend and poetry. And 'La Grèce et la Sicile' would be a convenient way of saying 'the ancient Greek world from east to west'. Now if one could take 'La Sicile' as a poetical term covering Sicily and Magna Graecia—the modern kingdom of the two Sicilies—Heredia would have a better case; for a close scrutiny of these poems shows that they are far less confined to Hellas and the East than Desonay suggests. For example: the scene of *L'Oubli*, fanciful as it may be, cannot but be in southern Italy or Sicily; the end of *Épigramme votive* reminds us of the epitaph of Aeschylus, on the tomb by the waters of Gela; the real name of the Hellé who raised a monument to her grasshopper was Philaenis and the epitaph was written by Leonidas of Tarentum—in Magna Graecia; *La Fileuse* is based on another epigram by Leonidas; the scene of *À Hermès Criophore* is near Tarentum; and *La Jeune Morte* undoubtedly reminds one of *La Jeune Tarentine*. These considerations put a different face on the matter. But, even if it were to appear that Heredia's classical learning was not extensive, it must be recalled that this test is not by itself decisive. One may arrive at an almost perfect understanding of the Greek spirit without very much learning; a certain poetical vision, a certain intuition, count for more. Did Heredia possess them?

HEREDIA'S TREATMENT OF THE MYTHS

The question can only be answered when one has read a few of the 'mythological sonnets' which occupy a place of honour in the *Trophées*. It is no disparagement of Heredia to say that he remembered Théodore de Banville in writing such poems as *Némée*, *Le Bain des Nymphes*, *Ariane* and *Le Vase*; or that the inspiration of *Jason et Médée* was supplied by a painting by Gustave Moreau, to whom the sonnet was dedicated. Moreau was apparently a favourite artist of Heredia's. But from the fact that Moreau painted a series of pictures illustrating the labours of Hercules, we cannot conclude that in his own cycle, *Hercule et les Centaures*, the poet necessarily had these in mind. He seems, on the contrary, to have remembered Ménard's lessons and to have referred from time to time, not only to *Du Polythéisme hellénique*, but to P. Decharme's more recent *Mythologie de la Grèce antique* (1879). The general order of these sonnets follows the lines laid down by Ménard: 'Après les travaux d'Héraklès viendraient ceux de Thésée et la guerre des Amazones, puis Jason, Médée et l'expédition des Argonautes, Méléagre, Atalante et la chasse de Kalydon, les combats de Perseus contre la Gorgone et de Bellérophon contre la Chimère.' A glance at Heredia's *recueil* will show that this is the order he follows.

He begins with the cycle of *Hercule et les Centaures*—a group of sonnets which had been published in the *Revue des deux Mondes* in 1888. The one devoted to the Nemean lion, with the unforgettable vision that presents itself to the fleeing shepherd as he pauses an instant to look back—and cry out—

Il s'écrie. Il a vu la terreur de Némée
Qui sur le ciel sanglant ouvre sa gueule armée,
Et la crinière éparse et les sinistres crocs—

must be counted as one of Heredia's major successes. Here, Ibrovac is not far from ascribing to the poet a scholarly interest in recent theories on mythology. Ménard had in fact observed that the myths of Apollo, Dionysus and Heracles were all in different ways representative of solar energy. 'Les travaux d'Héraklès représentent à la fois les luttes de la lumière contre les puissances malfaisantes des ténèbres et les luttes de la civilisation naissante contre les terribles obstacles que la nature fait naître sur les pas de l'humanité.' Heracles is not a god, but a hero whose virtues, sufferings and final sacrifice win for him a place on Olympus; the cult of the demi-gods serves in this way as a link between earth and heaven. On the other hand, more than one of the labours of Heracles are symbolical of the victory of the sun over the clouds. This, according

to Decharme, was the meaning of the legend of the Nemean Lion. The lion's skin, which Heracles carries on his shoulders, represents 'ces nuages fauves et bronzés que le soleil semble traîner derrière lui'. And there are verbal resemblances between this passage and the sonnet which make it certain that Heredia had the page before him and was familiar with this interpretation of the myth. But whether he intended to convey it is another matter. The unprejudiced reader will probably agree with Desonay that here, as in many other of the mythological sonnets—and probably in most of them—Heredia is mainly interested in the epic or picturesque features of the story.

An exception might be made in the case of *Stymphale*. The story was popular among the artists and poets of the time. Gustave Moreau had painted it, as E.-A. Bourdelle was subsequently to represent the 'archer of Stymphalus' in one of the most astonishing examples of modern French sculpture. Lake Stymphalus lay under Mount Cyllene in Arcadia; there were dense forests growing down to the water's edge. The birds or 'Stymphalidae', which fly above the lake in such thousands as to darken the sky, are explained as clouds which are dissipated at length by the sun's rays. Heredia was certainly familiar with this interpretation of the myth; but again, did he intend to convey it?

Stymphale

Et partout devant lui, par milliers, les oiseaux,
De la berge fangeuse où le Héros dévale,
S'envolèrent, ainsi qu'une brusque rafale,
Sur le lugubre lac dont clapotaient les eaux.
D'autres, d'un vol plus bas croisant leurs noirs réseaux,
Frôlaient le front baisé par les lèvres d'Omphale,
Quand, ajustant au nerf la flèche triomphale,
L'archer superbe fit un pas dans les roseaux.
Et dès lors, du nuage effarouché qu'il crible,
Avec des cris stridents plut une pluie horrible
Que l'éclair meurtrier rayait de traits de feu.
Enfin le soleil vit, à travers ces nuées
Où son arc avait fait d'éclatantes trouées,
Hercule tout sanglant sourire au grand ciel bleu.

Desonay refuses to see in these lines any logical unfolding of the symbol; and, of course, Heredia's object must have been poetical and not didactic. But the low-flying birds may well be seen to represent black rain clouds moving rapidly over the surface of this mountain lake. In the first tercet the 'nuage' of birds which comes down in a 'pluie horrible' must surely be a description of the last heavy rainstorm before the weather clears. 'L'éclair meurtrier' would then be an attempt to fuse two images in one—that of Heracles's arrows and that of the fiery sun-rays which

pierce the cloud; while the second tercet would depict the sun beholding, through these growing rifts in the 'nuées', the archer who is one of his symbols upon earth. One hardly sees how the meaning of the myth could be suggested more clearly without impairing the sense of illusion which a poem must create.

The avoidance of 'Stymphale' for the purpose of rhyming was the kind of 'gageure' which would appeal to Heredia. Faguet wrote an amusing commentary on it: 'Stymphale, mon ami, tu es beau, mais on est assez riche pour se passer de toi. Tu ne paraîtras que dans le titre; et nos rimes, dans la même sonorité, n'en seront pas moins somptueuses'. It is the aesthetic—and pictorial—qualities of the poem which call for special praise; and the same is true of the mythological sonnets as a whole. Only once may Heredia be said to have really invited, or provoked, an attempt at learned exegesis, and that is in the case of *La Magicienne* (1876):

L'Eumolpide vengeur n'a point dans Samothrace
Secoué vers le seuil les longs manteaux sanglants,
Et, malgré moi, je fuis, le cœur las, les pieds lents—

It is easy to recall that the ancestor of the Eumolpidae—the sacerdotal family of Eleusis—was said to have come from Thrace, and that mysteries were celebrated on the isle of Samothrace as well as at Eleusis; Heredia could have read in Ménard a description of the priest of Demeter shaking his purple robes towards the west when pronouncing a curse upon any who had profaned the mysteries. But the point here is that the 'avenging Eumolpid' has not done so; he has probably only been introduced to give colour to the story. If he really had a place in it, we might conclude that the sorceress whose charms the young hero has found such difficulty in escaping was a priestess of the great goddesses—which seems rather improbable. It is more likely, as Thauziès thought, that Heredia had in mind Horace's allusion to the 'Sabine incantations'; but poems as obscure as this are unusual.

A survey of the mythological sonnets as a whole shows that myths which were simply strange and moving, such as those of Io or Callisto, or myths which had a deep moral significance, such as those of Demeter and Persephone, did not appeal to him unless it was possible to give them a startling visual interpretation or, as in the case of *Sphinx*, express them in dramatic fashion. What he liked was the mighty sighing of Ocean, which

Emplit le ciel sonore où la pourpre se traîne;
or the moonlight casting far over the mountain-track
La gigantesque horreur de l'ombre Herculéenne;

best of all, perhaps, 'le ciel sanglant' against which a 'grand fauve' suddenly takes shape. Desonay is right in this matter; Heredia's temperament *is* that of a painter; it *is* true that in him 'le coloriste prend le pas sur le sculpteur, le peintre sur le statuaire'. But it is just, also, to consider him at his best, and at his best he is in the first rank. Readers of the *Trophées* will regret that the posthumous sonnets, which appeared in 1905, have not been included in the standard edition. *L'Enlèvement d'Antiope* is equal to most of the sonnets in this group; *La Vision d'Ajâx* superior to any.¹

There can, then, be no doubt of the answer to our question. Heredia's interpretation of the myths is always picturesque and usually poetical; his vision is frequently that of a true Hellenist.

HEREDIA AND GREEK ART

To those who deny Heredia a true feeling for Greek art, the first response of the amateur, the cultured but non-specialized reader, would be to ask: 'But is he not, like Leconte de Lisle and like the Greeks, the artist who loves to render his vision especially in *plastic form*; the man who sees "the terror of Nemea" opening his "armed jaws against the blood-red sky"; the man who sees the outline of the athlete as he strains forward in the race; who sees on the silver medallion "the pure profile of the virgins of Sicily"; who sees on the brow of the promontory the dark columns of the ruined temple and sometimes a herdsman who "sur l'azur infini dresse sa forme noire"? His principal ambition is surely to emulate the sculptor, to be, in the words of Henry Bordeaux,

¹ As this poem is hardly known to English or even French readers, one makes no excuse for quoting it

C'est Elle! Je la vois dans la nuit étoilée,
Ombre céruleenne et géante. Au ciel clair
Sa main droite brandit la lance où luit l'éclair,
Et l'autre tient captive une victoire ailée.
Pallas!... D'une nuée éclatante voilée,
Dont la splendeur bleuit l'ivoire de sa chair,
Et de ses pieds foulant l'impondrable éther,
Elle me dit: "— Prends garde à toi, fils d'Oùlé!"
Elle approche. Elle vient. Je ne recule pas.
Mais je sens que grandit à chacun de ses pas
La divine terreur de la Force et de l'Ordre.
En ses yeux glauques brille un sinistre dessein,
Et chaque battement de son cœur fait se tordre
Les vipères d'azur qui rampent sur son sein.

The conception is more or less that of the Athena Parthenos of Pheidias; except of course that in this, the temple-statue of the Parthenon, the spear was laid at the goddess's feet beside the shield and the coiled serpent which symbolized Erichthonius. See L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States*, Oxford, 1896, vol. I, p. 361. Heredia probably read the description in Pausanias.

"le roi de la poésie plastique"¹. And this view, which finds support in the authority of Brunetière, has been repeated so often as almost to become a commonplace.

But one has only to free one's mind of the prejudice and reopen the *Trophées* to discover that in sonnet after sonnet the taste for colour, for colours bright and dazzling, reveals itself more frequently and more spontaneously. One might have guessed as much from the fact that many poems of the Breton cycle were inspired by Lansyer, and one or two of the sonnets on mythology by Gustave Moreau. But a study of Heredia's letters from Italy proves more conclusively than anything else that here lay his native predilection. It led him to a spontaneous admiration for Rubens and the Venetian school, rather than for Leonardo, or Michael Angelo. Not that he clung to this when a greater excellence, as he felt, had been revealed to him. Commenting on the *Three Fates* of Michael Angelo in the Pitti Palace, he writes:

Le ton glacial de cette peinture dont le dessin est si tourmenté, ne me déplait pas, à moi l'amoureux de la couleur... D'ailleurs, à propos de la couleur, il n'y a que deux partis à prendre, celui des Vénitiens qui en font la raison d'être d'un tableau, qui devient une véritable fête pour les yeux et l'imagination, ou celui d'autres grands peintres qui lui ont préféré l'expression et le sentiment exquis ou grandiose des physionomies et des attitudes, comme Léonard de Vinci, Michel-Ange, Raphaël, Mantegna et beaucoup de primitifs. On les accuse de n'être pas coloristes, et cependant de quelle harmonie, de quel éclat discret et tendre, grave ou singulier, ils ont su animer ces physionomies mystérieuses de femmes....

He is making a conscious effort to wean himself from a taste which he feels defective.

Je suis parti pour l'Italie avec l'amour exclusif de la couleur et de l'effet, j'en reviens préférant le sentiment, non pas du tout comme on l'entend vulgairement....²

This taste for feeling as interpreted by art comes out well enough in the *Trophées*, which are by no means as 'impassive' as they seem; and one may prefer the tragic note of *Le Naufragé* and *La jeune Morte*, or the elegiac note of *L'Exilée*, to the sonorous and highly coloured sonnet sequences relating to Heracles, to Artemis and to Antony and Cleopatra; but it did not overlay or replace, at least for many years, an almost oriental love of colour, and not only are the sequences just mentioned better known, but they are much more characteristic of Heredia. Under the influence of an excellent model or a fortunate experience, his love of 'feeling' reappears; but when he follows his bent he composes such poems as *Jason et Médée*, *La Chasse* or *Nymphée*. Here the vision is, frankly, that of a painter. Can one say that this is un-Greek?

¹ *Âmes modernes*, p. 147.

² Letter to his mother, December 1864. Cited by Ibrovac, *op. cit.*, pp. 260-1.

Desonay, in speaking of that harmonious development and equilibrium of the faculties which is a mark of the Greek spirit, and of that 'perfect agreement between the idea and the form' that clothes it, which is the source of aesthetic pleasure in the plastic arts, finds in these qualities the secret of the excellence of Greek sculpture. He proceeds further to remark that the Greek genius is averse from '[les] inutiles audaces'. 'To limit ourselves to this question of colouring', he continues, 'we observe that Greek art, which is careful above all of form, *confined itself almost entirely to the field of statuary*,¹ while the poets, from Homer to Theocritus, are in their turn interested in creating groups rather than pictures: it is a bas-relief, and even a high-relief, literature which, in a framework which is certainly always sober, brings out the life animating noble attitudes and harmonious gestures.'

Without joining issue on the nature of Greek literature, of which Desonay's description appears at the best a rather narrow one, we may at least question the first part of his statement.

To suggest as he does that the artistic as distinct from the literary genius of Greece was 'almost exclusively' devoted to sculpture is to make an unfounded assumption. The reason of course is that amateurs still take their ideas of Greek art from the museums. The statues and bas-reliefs have survived; the paintings have almost entirely vanished.

It is true that in the development of Greek art sculpture took precedence of painting because of its early association with religion. When the temples were built, they were not to accommodate the worshippers who thronged in the *temenos* or sacred enclosure, but as homes for the gods—and also for the statues by which great sculptors attempted to express their idea of divinity. Then the frieze and pediments of the temples and parts of the interior were painted in gay colours.

For in and after the fifth century B.C.² painting was widely practised and highly honoured. To judge from the indications of ancient literature, Polygnotus, Zeuxis, and the great painters of the fourth century, Apelles and others, were not inferior to Leonardo and Michael Angelo. *All* their pictures have disappeared, frescoes and easel-paintings alike; but a copy of one of the masterpieces—the battle between Alexander and Darius—survives in a mosaic. The sense of grouping, the impetuous movement animating these masses of horsemen and spearmen, the terror and energy

¹ Our italics.

² It may be noted that the golden age of *Vase-Painting* was somewhat earlier, from ca. 550 to ca. 430 B.C.; but such great artists as Exekias, Epictetus, the Pan Painter and the Brygos Painter were more of draughtsmen than colourists (see C. T. Seltman, *Athenian Vase-Painting*, Harvard, 1933).

of battle, all give the most vivid idea of what the original must have been like. Pliny and other authors describe some of the paintings of the golden age; we know very little of them by other means. But we are able to form some idea of the paintings of the third century B.C. from the imitations which the journeymen who decorated the homes of wealthy Campanians made from the copy-books which they carried round with them. If Heredia had taken as his models, not the paintings of Gustave Moreau, but frescoes from Pompeii or Herculaneum, he would not have incurred the kind of reproach which has been brought against him.

But apart from paintings it has been truly observed that 'colour is of the very essence of Greek architecture'.¹ The first temples were of wood, the pediments and cornices being in painted terra-cotta. When stone was adopted, the triglyphs and cornices were painted in red and blue; the background of the pediment was coloured and the statues or figures in relief which occupied it were probably painted to resemble life. The pediments were usually surmounted by statues with gilded shield and spear. These temples were not of bare stone, inside and out, like a modern church: they were of marble or, if of stone, were entirely coated with a white and polished stucco which might be still more beautiful as it shone in the sun. The mouldings in the interior were almost certainly painted; and when we remember that the walls of the *cella* were often covered with noble pictures; that the statue of the god was sometimes in gold and ivory; and that numerous votive offerings were suspended from the columns or laid in the naves, we shall realize that the interior of a Greek temple was much richer and warmer in colouring than most modern churches, as the outside also was brighter and more vivid.

And it is equally true to say that colour played as great a part in the everyday scene for the Greek as it does for the majority of southern Europeans in the twentieth century. The agora of a Greek city was probably not, like the piazza of an Italian town, surrounded by houses painted in warm pinks and ochres; but the crowds of market-buyers in their white and coloured tunics and, in the background, the painted frescoes under the colonnades of the 'Stoa poikile' (as in Athens and Tarentum), would compensate for the lack of this feature. To reproach Heredia with a superficial understanding of ancient Greece because he is primarily a colourist is to ignore an essential element in Greek life and art.

But, may the critic object, it is a question of *literary* style. Is one then to suppose that in ancient Greece the arts of sculpture, painting and

¹ Percy Gardner, *Principles of Greek Art*, p. 130.

literature developed in isolation? Simonides is said to have described painting as dumb poetry and poetry as painting that speaks, and the saying was to be discussed for generations and revived in the eighteenth century by Dubos. One may question the aesthetic value of the idea, but it at least shows that the notion of a certain parallelism between the arts was present to the Greek mind.

In literature, on the other hand, it *is* true that the Greeks showed great sobriety in their use of colour; and we have to decide whether, in evoking the Hellenic world, we should imitate Hellenic style—or at least approach it in sobriety (which is what Desonay thinks, and with some reason)—or describe that world as it appears to *us* and in language corresponding to the modern sensibility. The first is Matthew Arnold's method and is seen to perfection in his fragments of an *Antigone* and a *Dejanaira*. The second, at its best, is the method of Keats; but it is also exemplified by Arnold in *The Strayed Reveller* and *Empedocles on Etna*. This offers us a vision, or rather a dream, of ancient Greece which is a different but perhaps equally legitimate means of interpreting something of which we can never have more than an approximate knowledge. That Keats, of all English poets, is one of those who have come nearest the Greek spirit, is generally agreed. But he could not be as familiar as Arnold with that spirit because he did not know Greek, and also because Chapman's Homer which had revealed so much to him was a Homer expressed in Elizabethan style and lacking therefore in that 'plainness and directness' which, as Arnold says, are marks of the real 'Homer', both as to ideas and to style.¹

If in spite of this we still prefer Keats's method, we should be sure that the flavour of our Hellenic poetry is as satisfying to the scholar—that is, the non-pédantic scholar—as it usually is in Keats. Judged by these standards, Heredia's method is nearer Keats's than Arnold's; but his temper as a rule less pure, less balanced, less Hellenic than Keats's.

HEREDIA AND THE EPIGRAM

Heredia never tired of the great subjects of Greek legend. As he treated them in successive sonnets he made steady progress, from the early *Triomphe d'Iacchos* (1863) and *Jason et Médée* (1872), which are certainly 'more tropical than Greek', to the finished perfection of *La Vision d'Ajazz* (1905). He cast off successively the not very happy influence of Banville, the dangerous influence of contemporary painters (which nevertheless had assisted him on occasion), and came to rely more and more on a sense

¹ 'On translating Homer', in *Works*, ed. Macmillan, 1903, vol. v, pp. 162, 176.

of mythology formed by Ménard and Decharme. Hence this long sequence of sonnets, stretching from 1861 to 1905, shows a growing refinement of taste, a shedding of bad native tendencies, a movement towards pure Hellenism.

This movement was no doubt assisted by his acquaintance with the poets of the Greek Anthology. He had begun to interest himself in the more intimate aspects of country life and private life among the Greeks and to take as his models the idyll and in particular the epigram, which enjoyed so wide a vogue during the Hellenistic period. 'A feature of the age', writes Mr Tarn, 'was the widespread mastery of the epigram and the fact that in it writers were not ashamed to show their feelings.... [The epigram] outlasted every other form of poetry and perished only with the Greek language.'¹

Although the master of the idyll, Theocritus, spent some time at the court of Ptolemy and is, in a sense, Alexandrian, he remained faithful to the Muses of Sicily, and it is the shepherds and country maidens of Sicily and Magna Graecia who are the subjects of his poems. Heredia does not seem to have owed much to his influence; he felt him through Virgil's *Eclogues*, as one can see in *Le Chevrier* and *Les Bergers*; but to the epigram he was deeply and directly indebted. Towards 1888 he had conceived the idea of adapting a number of the sepulchral epigrams from the *Anthology* in sonnet form, and the *Anthology* now became one of his favourite sources of inspiration.

The epigram was a genre well adapted to the Greek genius. It is concise but not condensed; nowhere is the art of selection better displayed. Whether the epigram has any such close affinities with the sonnet as M. Zilliacus and M. Ibrovac think, one may seriously doubt. The fact of both offering a form adapted 'to the concentrated expression of a thought or feeling' hardly suffices to make the sonnet the best medium for the translation of an epigram: there are other lyrical forms which are better. The epigram is much more simple, conveying limpidly and with ease the spontaneous expression of a single idea. Heredia's sonnets are, by comparison, packed with ideas and, too often, glittering with colours—but not always. What is certain is that Heredia now had before him, instead of the modern and not entirely beneficial influence of Banville and Leconte de Lisle, a series of the most finished poets who have ever lived.

The epigram had appeared at an early date, but it was from the fourth century B.C. to the Augustan Age that it enjoyed its heyday; from the

¹ *Hellenistic Civilisation*, 1930, pp. 242-3.

time of Anyte, Callimachus of Cyrene and Leonidas of Tarentum to the time of Meleager and Crinagoras. And it is significant that Heredia selects his models in this period, neglecting the great Simonides equally with the ingenious, humorous Agathias. To present these poets of the Hellenistic period as in any sense inferior workmen, to speak of the 'faults' of this literature as analogous to ours, is completely to misunderstand them. They offered models of feeling and taste which will never be surpassed, which are indeed so far in advance of our own day that the very notion of them is only open to a few. One may judge of this from their influence on Heredia and from his reactions.

The sepulchral epigrams are clearly the ones which appealed most directly to him. The charm of the descriptive and dedicatory epigrams, which are often simpler, would perhaps be only communicable to a mind steeped in the Hellenic tradition. The amatory epigrams he also ignores. Of the sepulchral epigrams he selects those which treat of the deaths of young men and young girls; he neglects those on mothers and virtuous wives, athletes, philosophers, pessimists and wine-bibbers. He evokes the 'melodious noise' of Philaenis's pet grasshopper, but not the joyful frolics of the dolphin, nor the death pangs of the war-horse, nor 'the resonant cry' of the partridge playing with his fellows 'through the shady coppice'. His selection is too meagre to be called representative; but it is evident that these simpler aspects of Greek poetry were better adapted to his muse than the grand themes of mythology; they restrained his penchant for colour and rhetoric.

He used the translation of the *Anthologia Palatina* which had been issued by Hachette in two volumes in 1863. The renderings were not always accurate; but one could hardly make this a ground of reproach to the anonymous scholar who was offering the *Anthology* for the first time in French and who modestly warned 'les amis des lettres grecques' that his work had been undertaken only 'pour leur faciliter la lecture d'un recueil dont on ne sentira bien que dans l'original le mérite et le charme'. It is a little doubtful whether Heredia took M. Dehèque at his word: the temptation to versify from a prose rendering in French was great. Admirers have nevertheless complimented him on the results. 'La matière souvent aride et maigre des petits poètes de l'hellénisme finissant a été, plus d'une fois, animée et fécondée par l'imagination de Heredia', declares M. Zilliacus; 'il y a presque toujours, dans les sonnets du poète français, une poésie plus riche et plus féconde que dans les épigrammes grecques qui lui ont servi de modèles.'

VOTIVE EPIGRAMS

We may seek, and find, this 'richer poetry' in *Épigramme votive* (1888), which was one of the first of the series to appear. The poet evokes a practice familiar among the religious-minded Hellenes—that of dedicating to the god the instruments of one's craft, or indeed anything which made one think of his favour. Leonidas speaks of the trophies he had seen hanging from the columns of a temple. One such trophy—the shield of the Trojan Euphorbus, which Menelaus had dedicated in a temple—was recognized one day as his own by Pythagoras of Samos, who knew then that in a former existence he had been Euphorbus. So again, in an epigram of Hegesippus, Arcestratus consecrates his shield to Heracles: 'let the War God's hateful strife be satisfied!' he says. Promachus, in an epigram of Mnasalcas, dedicates to Apollo a curved bow and empty quiver; the winged arrows, he adds, are in the heart of foes who received them in the fray; it is they who will offer them to the god.

If this poetry be 'arid', Heredia's sonnet is assuredly less so.

Au rude Arès! A la belliqueuse Discorde!
Aide-moi, je suis vieux, à suspendre au pilier
Mes glaives ébréchés et mon lourd boucher,
Et ce casque rompu qu'un crim sanglant déborde.

An aged warrior of the fifth century B.C.—the age to which this episode must belong—would have addressed the god in milder terms. Votive offerings were frequently made in consequence of a signal act of kindness or protection. A soldier dedicating his arms to a god would either utter a sigh of relief, as in the case of Arcestratus, or thank the god for sustaining and watching over him in the fight. He might invoke 'Dear Zeus' or 'Dear Artemis'; he would hardly invoke 'La belliqueuse Discorde' and proceed with a list of his arms and weapons—for the list is not closed.

Joins-y cet arc. Mais, dis, convient-il que je torde
Le chanvre autour du bois?—c'est un dur néflier
Que nul autre jamais n'a su faire plier—
Ou que d'un bras tremblant je tende encor la corde?
Prends aussi le carquois. Ton œil semble chercher
En leur gaine de cuir les armes de l'archer,
Les flèches que le vent des batailles disperse;
Il est vide. Tu crois que j'ai perdu mes traits?
Au champ de Marathon tu les retrouveras,
Car ils y sont restés dans la gorge du Perse.

There is something familiar here: these memories of Marathon can be no other than the memories of the old Aeschylus, standing in exile by

the 'white waters of Sicilian Gela'. There, casting back over the space of thirty years and more, over the cause of his exile and his triumphs at the Dionysia, and Salamis and the Persian wars, his mind came to rest on the day when he had fought in the front ranks of the Athenian hoplites. So, in the epitaph which he would ask the people of Gela to put over his grave, he would make no mention of his tragedies, but say only that Euphorion's son lay here, under the wheat-bearing earth, far from Athens his home; for the rest, 'Marathon and the short-haired Medes would speak of his valour'.

Heredia's Greek warrior does not practise the same reticence. He not only converses garrulously with the god, but offers him a surprising assortment of arms and weapons: an incredible assortment; for it is unlikely that a fifth-century Athenian, already specialized in the use of arms, would dedicate both sword and bow and quiver to Ares. Heredia would have done better to imitate the 'arid' brevity of Aeschylus, or stick closer to the 'meagre' details given by Mnasalcas.

He was better inspired in composing *Le Laboureur*:

Le semoir, la charrue, un joug, des socs luisants,
La herse, l'aiguillon et la faux acérée
Qui fauchaient en un jour les épis d'une airée,
Et la fourche qui tend la gerbe aux paysans;
Ces outils familiers, aujourd'hui trop pesants,
Le vieux Parmis les voue à l'immortelle Rhée—

Are we to agree with M. Desonay that this is 'the impersonal language of an auctioneer'? It is certain that the epigram by Antiphilus of Byzantium, on which the sonnet is modelled, has a simpler, more naive quality. But Heredia, who was fond of country life and possessed a large vocabulary of rustic terms, could hardly fail to add to the list of Parmis's instruments. Such enumerations are not rare in the *Anthology* and were sometimes ridiculed by the Greeks themselves, as in the case of a famous and touching epitaph by Pisander of Rhodes. In the present instance the long list adds to the sense of old Parmis's life of toil: moreover, the development of the epigram is Heredia's:

Ces outils familiers, aujourd'hui trop pesants,
Le vieux Parmis les voue à l'immortelle Rhée
Par qui le germe éclôt sous la terre sacrée.
Pour lui, sa tâche est faite; il a quatre-vingts ans.
Près d'un siècle, au soleil, sans en être plus riche,
Il a poussé le couteau au travers de la friche;
Ayant vécu sans joie, il vieillit sans remords.
Mais il est las d'avoir tant peiné sur la glèbe
Et songe que peut-être il faudra, chez les morts,
Labourer des champs d'ombre arrosés par l'Érèbe.

This interpretation of the old man's thoughts with all their weariness and pathos, this heavy sense of desolation, is Heredia's. One may perhaps question its historical accuracy, the more so as there is no warrant for it in Antiphilus's poem. A countryman's life in ancient Greece was usually a hard one; whether it was normally 'sans joie' is another matter. Parmis, in fact, bears a strong resemblance to La Bruyère's peasants. The likelihood of a Greek peasant's so contemplating the next world is, however, not perhaps incredible, if we admit the 'vie sans joie'; and if the poet had not mistaken Erebus for a river, one would have been disposed to count this sonnet as one of his successes.

THE SEPULCHRAL EPIGRAMS

The death of a son, his father's only hope, the death of a young mother, taking her child with her, 'to remind her of his father'—the pathos of these themes is commemorated in some of the most touching of the sepulchral epigrams. So also the death of a young girl on the threshold of marriage:

Not marriage but Death for bridegroom did Clearista receive....

Poet after poet returns to this theme which seemed tragic beyond the passing of those who had known, if only for a year, the fullness of life. Heredia's *La Jeune Morte* is an original treatment of the subject rather than an adaptation. We no longer hear the one sad dirge, but see the plants and living things about the dead girl's tomb: the value of life to all that is young becomes the keynote of the poem, and it is as Hellenic as the other.

Qui que tu sois, Vivant, passe vite parmi
L'herbe du tertre où git ma cendre inconsolée;
Ne foule point les fleurs de l'humble mausolée
D'où j'écoute ramper le lierre et la fourmi.
Tu t'arrêtes? Un chant de colombe a gémi.
Non! qu'elle ne soit pas sur ma tombe immolée!
Si tu veux m'être cher donne lui la volée.
La vie est si douce, ah! laisse-la vivre, ami.

Poignant above all is the cry of those who have perished in the wastes of 'the unharvested sea', or lie without burial on a distant shore. The sea which penetrated their country on almost every side, which they had to cross for their principal trading, which separated the various branches of the Greek family more than it has separated any family of nations but our own—the sea was an object of dread and almost of hatred for the Greek. 'Keep off from me, thou fierce sea, eight cubits' space and swell and roar with all thy might. But if thou dost destroy the tomb of Eumares, naught shall it profit thee, for naught shalt thou

find but bones and ashes.'¹ After the spring storms which came in the month Mounychion the merchant ships would set out in all directions, for the Euxine and the Levant, for Cyrene and Magna Graecia and distant Massilia. Then, for four or five months there would be fair weather; but it was wise to be snug in harbour from 'the rising of rainy Arcturus' (September) until after the time 'when the kids are setting' (November). In the month Poseideon (December) the Sea-God was used to smooth out the waves with his trident: then one might venture out and coast prudently along the mainland, with a harbour in reach; but there was no great security until the following April. The small vessels of the Ancients were not made to resist storms, and experiences like St Paul's between Cyprus and Malta were a matter of normal occurrence for Greek mariners. Happy, in their eyes, was the life of a shepherd among the grassy hills;² for as 'a mother is sweeter than a stepmother' so 'is earth dearer than the grey sea'. Even in his long sleep, the shipwrecked mariner could not forget the 'sleepless' waves. 'Even among the dead', we read in an epigram of Archias of Byzantium, 'the hateful roar of the billows sounds in my ears'.³ Woe to the rash sailor who finds himself in mid-ocean during a November storm.

Heedless, Theotimus, of the coming evil setting of rainy Arcturus, didst thou set out on thy perilous voyage, which carried thee and thy companions, racing over the Aegean in the many-oared galley, to Hades. Alas for Aristodice and Eupolis, thy parents, who mourn thee, embracing thy empty tomb.⁴

The bitterness of grief becomes softened—or so one fancies—in the later epigrams, but this was perhaps because the Roman Peace had suppressed piracy and brought a general political security to the Mediterranean lands.

Be called Erotides, ye Oxeiai [writes Crinagoras, the contemporary of Horace], it is no shame for you to change; for Eros himself gave both his name and his beauty to the boy whom Dies laid here beneath a heap of clods. O earth, crowded with tombs, and sea that washeth on the shore, do thou lie light on the boy, and thou lie hushed for his sake.⁵

Le Naufragé (1893) gives no unworthy echo to these moving verses, and Heredia's gift of visualization appears to advantage in the opening picture of the great lighthouse at Alexandria, which seems to the young sea captain to flee away beyond the rigging of his ship as she leaves the harbour—

¹ By Asclepiades, Book VII, no. 284. Trans. W. R. Paton.

² Cf. Book VII, no. 636 (by Crinagoras).

³ Book VII, no. 278. Trans. W. R. Paton.

⁴ Book VII, no. 539. By Perses (ca. 300 B.C.). Trans. W. R. Paton.

⁵ Book VII, no. 628. Trans. W. R. Paton.

Avec la brise en poupe et par un ciel serein,
 Voyant le Phare fuir à travers la mâture,
 Il est parti d'Égypte au lever de l'Arcture,
 Fier de sa nef rapide aux flancs doublés d'airain.

Il ne reverra plus le môle Alexandrin.
 Dans le sable où pas même un chevreau ne pâture
 La tempête a creusé sa triste sépulture;
 Le vent du large y creuse quelque arbuste marin.

Au pli le plus profond de la mouvante dune,
 En la nuit sans aurore et sans astre et sans lune,
 Que le navigateur trouve enfin le repos.

O Terre, ô Mer, pitié pour son ombre anxieuse!
 Et sur la rive hellène où sont venus ses os,
 Soyez-lui, toi, légère, et toi, silencieuse.

The concluding invocation is an almost literal transcript from Crinagoras, or rather from Dehèque's version, which might perhaps be bettered. Crinagoras had written:

ὦ χθὼν σηματοέσσα, καὶ ἡ παρὰ θινὶ θάλασσα,
 παῖδι σὺ μὲν κούφη κείσο, σὺ δ' ἡσυχίῃ,

which means: 'O earth full of tombs and sea [that washest] on the shore, do thou lie light on the boy, and thou quiet.' Dehèque had translated, 'O terre amoncelée sur cette tombe'; but *σηματοέσσα* must mean 'full of tombs', 'crowded with tombs', as Mr Paton says—a familiar image to the Hellenes who thought of the multitude of the dead as far outnumbering that of the living: more poignant, and also making better sense; for if the earth were 'piled on the tomb', how could it lie lightly? One doubts whether Heredia grasped the value of *σηματοέσσα*: otherwise, he would hardly have resisted taking this trophy for his poem.

To attempt, as in this sonnet, to mingle the inspiration of the early Hellenistic age with that of the Augustan might seem perilous; but the general feeling is Hellenistic, and *Le Naufragé* may be counted as an example of successful adaptation.

One cannot say quite as much of *La Prière du Mort* (1890). Doubtless, there is warrant in the *Anthology* for almost everything in the sonnet: in the record of the traveller who, 'hastening to glorious Sparta', was murdered by brigands (VII, 544); and of those other two who adjure the passer-by, 'by Zeus, protector of strangers', to tell their father 'in Aeolian Thebes that Menis and Polynicus are no more' (VII, 540, by Damagetes). So also Perses speaks of parents who embrace an empty tomb (VII, 539). It seems hypercritical to suggest, with Vianey, that this Greek of Heredia's who exclaims: 'Nul n'a vengé mon trépas', sounds more like a Norseman than a Greek. True, there is an anonymous

epigram (vii, 310) which Vianey might have quoted in support of his view:

He who slew me buried me, hiding his crime: since he gives me a tomb, may he meet with the same kindness in return.

But what cultured irony is in these words! The feelings of Heredia's Greek may, it is true, be more Scandinavian—or Corsican—but the theme of vengeance is common enough in the older Greek literature to afford a justification for Heredia.

Heredia could not fail to be struck by the epigrams of Leonidas of Tarentum—pastorals, votive epigrams, sepulchral epigrams and other pieces which are numerous in Books vi and vii of the *Anthologia Palatina* and which have recently been beautifully translated by Dr Edwyn Bevan. Leonidas wrote for children and sailors, for poor artisans and the country folk whom he met on his wanderings. If at times he took a hand in politics or wrote for Neoptolemus and Pyrrhus, the Epirote *condottieri*, he remained at his best the poet of simple things; and there has never been a better. He has been compared with W. H. Davies, and again with Gray; but beyond and above the voice of this country Muse, there is at times in his work a note of deep, almost cosmic, melancholy, as in the great poem beginning:

Measureless time or ever thy years, O man, were reckoned;
 Measureless time shall run over thee, low in the ground;
 And thy life between is—what? The flick of a flying second,
 A flash, a point—or less, if a lesser thing can be found.
 Poor little life!—not even, so fugitive, fill'd with pleasure!
 Hateful is death, but life hath a bitterer taste of tears.
 Behold the groundwork of bones! Exactly drawn to that measure,
 Do ye exalt your brows, O men, to the cloudy spheres?¹

His epigram for old Platthis who 'near the door of gray old age used to sing a tune to her spindle and familiar distaff' was adapted by Heredia in *La Fileuse*—one of the posthumous sonnets of 1905. Here the development is happier, more true to Greek feeling, than in *La Prière du Mort*. There is certainly an echo of Leonidas in *Les Bergers* (1888), which is commonly supposed to have been inspired by Virgil; but it is in the sonnet to the dead grasshopper that he has left his deepest mark.

The Greeks were very fond of their animals. At Akragas the young men raised tombs to their horses and the girls to their pet doves. In these western colonies, as in old Greece, men lived so near to the hills and woods that it did not occur to them to separate the wild things from that divine nature from which all were sprung. So the epigrams to

¹ Trans. E. Bevan.

domestic animals are not poets' fancies but the expressions of a general feeling. Dr Mackail writes:

Even the pets of the household have their slight memorial and their lasting rest. The shrill cicala, silent and no more looked on by the sun, finds a place on the meadows whose flowers the Queen of the Dead herself keeps bright with dew. The sweet-throated song-bird, the faithful watch-dog, the speckled partridge in the coppice, go at the appointed time upon their silent way—*ipsas angusti terminus aevi excipit*—and come into human sympathy because their brief life is taken to its rest like man's own in so brief a term.¹

So, too, we have the epigram for the ox, too old for service, whom his grateful master does not send to the slaughter-house but leaves in the meadow to graze and rest;² for the magpie who of old used to answer shepherds and woodmen, and often like Echo utter mocking cries, but who now lies dead, 'having renounced his passion for mimicry';³ for the dolphin who would arch his neck as he rushed up from the depths, or, dancing to the sound of the flute, throw high the spray around the ship, until, one day, the storm casts him up so that he lies dead on the narrow beach.⁴ If the Greeks built tombs and made epitaphs for their own animals, this was probably for religious as well as for sentimental reasons; or rather because there was no more absolute break between the animal and human than between the human and divine. They felt that those animals we take into our homes as companions deserve our special affection; if we misuse them, we shall be pursued by their Erinyes.⁵

To the reader of to-day the story of Philaenis's grasshopper seems no more than the pretty fancy of a child: to the poet of Tarentum it was, like other dear and lovely things, only one aspect of a nature which touched religion on every side. For the nether world, one did not doubt, would be peopled with the shades of the birds and beasts and insects which had gladdened our life upon earth. So the names of faithful animals might appear with the name of their master on the tomb where all reposed:

The man's name was Hippaemon, the horse's Podargos, the dog's Lethargos, and the serving man's Babes, a Thessalian, from Crete, of Magnesian race, the son of Haemon. He perished fighting in the front ranks.

To some among the Ancients this epitaph by Pisander of Rhodes appeared droll: it is obviously naïve and touching. There is, on the other hand, a literary, a sophisticated element in the poems where Meleager calls upon the cicada in the tree above him to strike up a new tune, so

¹ *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*, London, 1906. Introduction, p. 80.

² See Walter Leaf, *Little Poems from the Greek*, 1922, vol. i.

³ Book vii, no. 191 (by Archias). Trans. W. R. Paton.

⁴ Book vii, no. 215 (by Anyte) and no. 214 (by Archias).

⁵ T. Zielinski, *The Religion of Ancient Greece*, pp. 40-2, 45.

that he may escape from the cares of love and snatch an hour's sleep;¹ as there is in his address to the locust, with its charming periphrases:

Ἄκρίς, ἐμῶν ἀπάτημα πόθων, παραμύθιον ὕπνου,
ἄκρίς, ἀρουραῖη Μοῦσα, λιγυπτέρυγε,
αὐτοφνὲς μίμημα λύρας, κρέκε μοί τι ποθεινόν....²

But the balance between style and sentiment is perfect in the work of such writers as Anyte and Leonidas. Anyte tells how for her locust and her cicada little Myro made one tomb, 'shedding girlish tears; for inexorable Hades hath carried off her two pets';³ while Leonidas writes an epigram in form for Philaenis's grasshopper:

Wayfarer, though the tombstone that surmounts my grave seems small and almost on the ground, blame not Philaenis. Me, her singing locust, that used to walk on thistles, a thing that looked like a straw, she loved and cherished for two years, because I made a melodious sound. And even when I was dead she cast me not away, but built this little monument of my varied talent.⁴

This was the piece which Heredia took as the basis of his sonnet, though he was not very well served by Dehèque's rendering of it. Leonidas had written:

τὴν γὰρ αἰοῖδον
ἀκρίδα. τὴν εὔσαν τὸ πρὶν ἀκανθοβάτιν,
διπλοῦς ἐς λυκάβαντας ἐφίλατο τὴν καλαμίτιν....

Dehèque makes the grasshopper sing 'sur les buissons et dans les chaumes', and says that Philaenis 'l'a aimée deux ans, l'a nourrie'. But ἐφίλατο probably only denotes 'loved and cared for', while ἀκανθοβάτις means 'going on thorns', i.e. on a prickly plant such as a thistle or thorn-bush. In the line which might be seriously misinterpreted

διπλοῦς ἐς λυκάβαντας ἐφίλατο τὴν καλαμίτιν,

καλαμίτις can hardly be a mere alternative for ἀκρίς, but must denote 'the straw-like thing', that is, of course, the ἀκρίς. These homely and authentic touches disappear under Heredia's wand, which evokes for us a *green* grasshopper singing amid such high-class plants as the trefoil and the whortleberry!

Ici gît, Étranger, la verte sauterelle
Que durant deux saisons nourrit la jeune Hellé,
Et dont l'aile vibrant sous le pied dentelé
Bruissait dans le pin, le cytise ou l'airelle.
Elle s'est tue, hélas! la lyre naturelle,
La muse des guérets, des sillons et du blé;
De peur que son léger sommeil ne soit troublé,
Ah! passe vite, ami, ne pèse point sur elle.
C'est là. Blanche, au milieu d'une touffe de thym,
Sa pierre funéraire est fraîchement posée.
Que d'hommes n'ont pas eu ce suprême destin!

¹ Book VII, no. 196.

² Book VII, no. 195.

³ Book VII, no. 190. Trans. W. R. Paton.

⁴ Book VII, no. 198. Trans. W. R. Paton.

Des larmes d'un enfant sa tombe est arrosée,
 Et l'Aurore pieuse y fait chaque matin
 Une libation de gouttes de rosée.

'La lyre naturelle' (αὐτοφύεῖς μίμημα λύρας) and 'la muse des guérets' (ἀρουραῖη Μοῦσα) are acknowledgements to Meleager; and 'Des larmes d'un enfant. . .' is a reminiscence of little Myro. Yet the sonnet is more than a skilful mosaic; it is a charming evocation.

The poems to which it takes us back are no doubt what M. Martino calls 'les mignardises de l'Anthologie'. But does the word fit? 'Mignardises' there certainly are in the *Anthology*, but they belong to a much later period. When the partridge belonging to Agathias Scholasticus has its head bitten off by the cat (VII, 204), the poet asks whether the 'ailouros' still expects to dwell in his halls. 'No! dear partridge, I will not leave thee unhonoured in death, but on thy body I will slay thy foe. For thy spirit grows ever more perturbed until I perform the rites that Pyrrhus executed on the tomb of Achilles'.¹ We feel sure, none the less, that the 'ailouros' got off with no more than a whipping; did not Damocharis, a pupil of Agathias, himself address an epigram to this 'most wicked of cats', in which he concluded: 'Thy heart is set now on partridges, but the mice meanwhile are dancing, running off with thy dainties'²?

These are the 'mignardises' of the *Anthology* and their witty authors 'les petits poètes de l'hellénisme finissant'. But they were writing in the sixth century of our era, not in the time of Leonidas or even of Meleager. When M. Ibrovac, impressed by what seems to him the 'modern' tone of certain Greek poets, observes: 'les épigrammes de Méléagre et d'Archias semblent avoir été écrites de nos jours par une main moins ferme que celle de l'auteur des *Trophées*', one can only be astonished. M. Zilliacus, less naively, concludes that 'il y a presque toujours, dans les sonnets du poète français, une poésie plus riche et plus profonde que dans les épigrammes grecques qui lui ont servi de modèles'. This may be true as regards 'richesse'; it is never true of their 'profondeur'. Heredia's sonnets are not greater than the epigrams of Archias, Perses and the others: they are different.

And—despite the manifest success of *Le Naufragé*, *La Jeune Morte* and *Épigramme funéraire*—he was probably better inspired by the bucolic Muse, when he recalled a few lines from Virgil or Horace or from Leonidas's pastoral poems, and for the general picture relied on his knowledge of country life in ancient Hellas.

¹ Book IV, no. 205. Trans. W. R. Paton.

² Book IV, no. 206.

THE VIRGILIAN MOOD

Reading the first eclogue, Heredia found in the concluding words of Tityrus, in his invitation to the goat-herd Meliboeus to rest with him for the night, a *motif* for *Le Chevrier* (1888):

Hic tamen hanc mecum poteris requiescere noctem
Fronde super viridi: sunt nobis mitia poma,
Castaneae molles et pressi copia lactis....

But only a *motif*; for the scene has changed now from Italy to Arcadia, 'a land which', as Zieliński says, 'remaining predominantly pastoral even in historic times, preserved better than other regions the traditions of the pastoral epoch'.¹ We are no longer shaded by the beechwoods and chestnut forests of the Alps, but are in 'a harsh ravine' on the slopes of Mount Maenalus. 'Follow no further', says the goat-herd:

O berger, ne suis pas dans cet âpre ravin
Les bonds capricieux de ce bouc indocile;
Aux pentes du Ménale, où l'été nous exile,
La nuit monte trop vite et ton espoir est vain.
Restons ici, veux-tu? J'ai des figues, du vin.
Nous attendrons le jour en ce sauvage asile.
Mais parle bas. Les Dieux sont partout, ô Mnasye!
Hécate nous regarde avec son œil divin.

One can hardly picture the mountains of Arcadia without evoking their god, Hermes, whom Maia bore on Cyllene, or his son, 'the fantastic guardian-spirit of goats, Pan the goat-legged'.² Heredia's shepherds (*Les Bergers*, 1888) bring him a ewe with her lamb as an offering:

Viens. Le sentier s'enfonce aux gorges de Cyllène.
Voici l'ancre et la source, et c'est là qu'il se plaît
À dormir sur un lit d'herbe et de serpolet
À l'ombre du grand pin où chante son haleine.
Attache à ce vieux tronc moussu la brebis pleine.
Sais-tu qu'avant un mois, avec son agnelet,
Elle lui donnera du fromage, du lait?
Les Nymphes fileront un manteau de sa laine.
Sois-nous propice, Pan! ô Chèvre-pied, gardien
Des troupeaux que nourrit le mont Arcadien,
Je t'invoque... Il entend! J'ai vu tressaillir l'arbre.
Partons. Le soleil plonge au couchant radieux.
Le don du pauvre, ami, vaut un autel de marbre,
Si d'un cœur simple et pur l'offrande est faite aux Dieux.

Here the reminiscences of Virgil and Horace³ are fused in a poem which seems wholly Greek and which owes less to them perhaps than to Leonidas. In his commentary on this sonnet M. Ibrovac seems to

¹ *The Religion of Ancient Greece*, p. 43.

³ Virgil, *Éclogue* 1; Horace, Book III, Ode XXIII, 13.

² *Ibid.*, p. 22.

have devoted attention only to the details. Heredia's principal model must have been one of the early poems which Leonidas wrote for Neoptolemus and which has been thus rendered by Professor F. A. Wright:

Ye caves and thou most sacred hill
Where nymphs with white limbs gleam,
Ye rocks that front the babbling rill
And pine-trees by the stream,
Thou, too, great Hermes, Maia's child,
Four-squared our flocks to guard,
And Pan who from the cliff peaks wild
The pasturing goats dost ward,
Accept ye all these gifts of mine,
This barley-cake, this cup of wine.¹

'Comme Pan, dont il est le père, Hermès préside à la génération; il... augmente la richesse par la multiplication des troupeaux', writes Ménard in a passage² which provides the starting-point for *À Hermès Criophore* (1893).

Here we are still with the Arcadian god, and among the shepherds and goat-herds who honour him; but this time in Magna Graecia, on the grassy banks of the Galaesus dear to the flocks with the skin coats that protect their fleece, as Horace describes them, dearer still to the Dorians who came here with Phalanthus, 'the Laconian king':

Ille terrarum mihi praeter omnes
Angulus ridet....³

The god is described here as 'compagnon des Naiades' because, as Zieliński says, 'the nymphs of the waters and the meadows were the companions and assistants of the rustic gods—of Hermes and Pan'.

Pour que le compagnon des Naiades se plaise
À rendre la brebis agréable au bélier
Et qu'il veuille par lui sans fin multiplier
L'errant troupeau qui broute aux berges de Galèse,
Il faut lui faire fête—

The rest of the poem is based on an epigram attributed to Ibycus but probably by an unknown author (no. 17 of the *Anthology* of Planudes).⁴

These poems show that Heredia possessed a better sense of mythology and a truer feeling for rustic life in Greece than M. Desonay admits. 'Les dieux sont partout, ô Mnasye!' In the ice-cold water of the spring, in the tree whose leaves shelter him from the sun, even among the mountain crags, the countryman feels the presence of friendly gods.

¹ *Anthologia Palatina*, vi, 334. See *A History of later Greek Literature*, p. 58.

² *Du Polythéisme hellénique*, p. 44.

³ Horace, Book II, Ode vi.

⁴ J. W. Mackail, *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*, pp. 147 and 360.

Their kindness to him and his flocks he will return by humble offerings. Whatever Heredia's shortcomings in other respects, he conveyed a good impression of the divinity of Nature.

Nor do his pictures of Hellenic life suffer from being seen, in part, through the medium of Virgil and Horace. He is perhaps safer in their company than when he approaches the Greek poets alone, and few of his sonnets contain a truer feeling for the ancient world than the one in which he paraphrases the Ode 'Sic te diva . . .'.¹ The first two quatrains closely follow the opening verses in which Horace forms hopes and prayers for the vessel that is carrying Virgil to Greece.

Sic te diva potens Cypri,
Sic fratres Helenae, lucida sidera,
Ventorumque regat pater,
Obstrictis alius praeter lapyga,
Navis, quae tibi creditum
Debes Vergilium; finibus Atticis
Reddas incolumem, precor,
Et serves animae dimidium meae.

Heredia was never content with the expression of a feeling; he was 'modern' enough to require a picture; and it was natural that he should depict the vessel as it made its way over the Ionian Sea towards the Aegaeon and the Cyclades. So he continues, in his invocation of the Dioscuri:

À travers l'Archipel où le dauphin se joue,
Guidez heureusement le chanteur de Mantoue;
Prêtez-lui, fils du Cygne, un fraternel rayon.
La moitié de mon âme est dans la nef fragile
Qui, sur la mer sacrée où chantait Arion,
Vers la terre des Dieux porte le grand Virgile.

The tercets afford a good example of Heredia's theories regarding rhyme. He held that so far from limiting the poet's expression, rhyme should liberate and enrich it. He excellently compared rhyme to a spring-board. 'Il m'est arrivé à moi-même', he said, 'de trouver, par le souci des rimes, des pensées intéressantes.' Thus in one of the best sonnets of *Hortorum Deus* it seems likely that the word 'Lare' suggested 'hilare', which adds humour to the piece and is in keeping with the other qualities of the domestic god. In the present instance one wonders whether Heredia beginning, as he usually did, with the tercets, did not first write:

À travers l'Archipel . . .
Guidez heureusement le chanteur de Mantoue,

and whether 'Mantoue' did not suggest 'joue' and 'se joue', and so 'où le dauphin se joue'. *Pour le vaisseau de Virgile* belongs to the same year

¹ Horace, Book I, Ode III.

(1888) as four of the *Épigrammes et Bucoliques*. Various epigrams in the *Anthology* must have familiarized him at this time with the dolphin, drawn as the Ancients believed by the sound of the flute, gambolling around the ship's bows. And once the dolphin was introduced, 'Arion' rhyming with 'rayon', followed naturally in the second tercet as also his figure was suggested by the Ionian Sea which the vessel crossed on its way from Brundisium. For it was on this sea that the great musician had been robbed and thrown overboard—to be caught up miraculously by a dolphin and transported with miraculous speed to Corinth, so the story ran.

One can hardly say that in the *Épigrammes et Bucoliques* Heredia gives us what, in Vianey's words, he had proposed: 'de la vie privée des Grecs une peinture précise où bien des traits sont d'un intérêt éternellement humain.' He offers us only aspects and glimpses of that life, always poetical and frequently accurate.

There are times when his understanding of the Greek temper seems perfect; and then again one has the impression that it was neither very deep nor very wide. To attempt to adapt the epigrams as sonnets, and to call the latter 'épigrammes', shows a misunderstanding of the epigram: half a dozen lyrical forms are better fitted for the purpose, as our own translators know.¹ Cory's famous rendering of Callimachus's epigram for Heracleitus² reads like a piece of native English; but it is nearer the Greek spirit than any sonnet could be. To Heredia's *Épigramme votive* who would not really prefer Professor Wright's unpretentious translation of one of Leonidas's votive epigrams:

This noiseless ball and top so round,
This rattle with its lively sound,
These bones with which he loved to play,
Companions of his childhood's day,
To Hermes, if the god they please,
An offering from Philocles.³

Épigramme funéraire is, in its way, a perfect thing; but it is hardly an epigram. This is an epigram:

He came from Malta; and Eumelus says
He had no better dog in all his days.
We called him Bull; he went into the dark.
Along those roads we cannot hear him bark.⁴

¹ See A. C. Benson, *The Reed of Pan*, 1922; *The Oxford Book of Greek Verse in Translation*, passim.

² *Ibid.*, no. 513 (p. 584).

³ *Anthologia Palatina*, Book VI, no. 309. See *A History of later Greek Literature*, p. 72. By Tymnes, Book VII, no. 211. Trans. Edmund Blunden (*Oxford Book of Greek Verse in Translation*, p. 578).

We do not mean to compare Heredia and Mr Blunden to the advantage of either; but is it not clear that whereas the latter has put a Greek into an English epigram, Heredia has simply composed a beautiful French sonnet? All of which goes to show that his experiments arose from a failure to appreciate the true character of the epigram. That he had an obscure sense of this is evident from his manner of proceeding. Feeling the need for matter, he would take the cream off two, three or even four epigrams and then operate a kind of condensation. This might make a good sonnet in the manner of *Épigramme funéraire*; but it was a dangerous process when one tried to develop a single theme: it meant invention with its attendant perils (*Épigramme votive*), but might result in something very Hellenic (*La Jeune Morte*).

One feels that a calmer temperament and somewhat more of what Arnold calls 'inwardness' were needed to make Heredia a perfect interpreter of Greek life. Yet he had a genuine, if exuberant, vein of poetry, and he was never more successful than when he subdued himself to a simple or an elegiac tone, as in *L'Exilée*. Perhaps a more careful apprenticeship would have sufficed. Had he begun by rendering into quatrains the descriptive epigrams of Anyte and then paraphrased the longer, yet still simple pastoral poems of Leonidas, before attempting the more difficult sepulchral epigrams, he would have purified his taste and might have enriched modern French poetry with some beautiful verses.

THE MAN

The question may still be asked whether Heredia in his character and life was more of a Hellene than in his poems; though one must doubt whether a man could cultivate the sonnet as his almost exclusive medium of expression over a period of forty years without giving a fairly complete idea of his personality. And of personality there was no lack, either on the physical side or the moral. 'M. José-Maria de Hérédia, l'excellent poète qui est tout éclat et toute sonorité, qui pétille, crépite, et rayonne sans cesse', was Anatole France's impression.¹ And, indeed, Heredia in his young manhood had been a figure to draw attention even on the Boulevard, and still more on the beach at Douarnenez. With his black, silky beard and costly ties, as dazzling as his sonnets, with his opulent cigars and resounding accents, he was something of the Spanish grandee, with a touch of the flamboyant and a flavour of Latin America. He had his oddities, too, a habit, quite innocent and inoffen-

¹ *La Vie littéraire*, 1ère série, ed. 1930, p. 248.

sive, of unexpected observations on the ways of the man of the world (his friends addressed him as 'ἄνθρωπος τοῦ κόσμου'), and a custom, already alluded to, when reciting his verses of prolonging the first consonant of an important word so as almost to give the impression of stammering, and also of making a slight hiccough on the penultimate syllable of the last verse of a sonnet.

But if such mannerisms do not fulfil our idea of the perfect taste and balance of an Athenian gentleman of the grand epoch, we may remember that this idea is itself highly conventional; and also that in deeper matters Heredia practised the art of living as few but the Greeks have practised it. He possessed the charm and good looks, the perfect health, the ability and the private fortune which enabled him to live easily and harmoniously. He knew—what a certain number of writers have known—that writing is only a part of the art of living; not more important than life, though not less important. Even in his writing he followed the precept of 'little and good'; he had the sense to see that 'in art it is only the excellent that counts'; and in an age when commercialism was permeating literature and authors were being admired in proportion to their output, he persisted in writing with a moderation which men like Hugo and Zola would have done well to imitate. There is thus something Hellenic in the taste which he displayed in the conduct of his career.

He had a high, though not exaggerated, idea of his work. At the time of his candidature for the Academy, when Zola was one of his rivals, he told the author of *La Terre* with a frankness which is more amusing to read of than it can have been to his hearer, that a hundred years hence he, Zola, would not be read, 'tandis que moi, c'est bien le diable si, sur cent sonnets, je n'en ai pas un ou deux dans une anthologie'—which, taken as a whole, will probably be near the truth. Almost everyone with a knowledge of French has read one or two sonnets of Heredia.

The anthologies, however, rarely show him at his best. Not that he has been as ill-served in this matter as Leconte de Lisle, whose *Midi, roi des étés* was quoted to satiety in the poet's lifetime; or as Sully Prudhomme, who at social gatherings was compelled to recite *Le Vase brisé* until all the pain—and the romance—behind that little poem had been sullied and destroyed for him. Yet *Antoine et Cléopâtre* appears rather more frequently in the anthologies than it deserves; and though the poet was fond enough of reciting it, one wonders whether a poet such as he is not better seen when a rare grace visits him than in his more characteristic moods. He might even win a new popularity if instead of selecting *Fuite de Centaures*, *Sour de Bataille* and the eternal

Antoine et Cléopâtre, the editors of anthologies selected the beautiful *Exilée* (which Lemaître set above all the other sonnets), or *Sur le Livre des Amours de Pierre de Ronsard*, or *La Dogaresse* (where the poet's taste for colour finds appropriate and harmonious expression); or *Sur un marbre brisé*; or perhaps, for its delightful mingling of tears and humour:

Quel froid! le givre brille aux derniers pampres verts;
Je guette le soleil—

the plaint of the rustic god, abandoned in some country villa in the Tiber valley. But the cycle of Greek sonnets would assuredly contribute its share, with *Le Chevrier* or *Les Bergers*, *Épigramme funéraire* or *Le Naufragé*, and, above all, the splendid *Vision d'Ajux*.

CONCLUSION

Heredia is not greater than Callimachus or Leonidas—*tant s'en faut!* But he tried to be their disciple for a time, and not unsuccessfully; they, if they could return, would probably judge him less harshly than M. Desonay. For more than one reader has been brought back by the *Trophées* to the study of Greek poets whom he had loved but neglected since schooldays; others, who had never read them, have come, through Heredia, to know a higher excellence than the more modern poetry offers. The mission of Heredia, who in his way sincerely tried to dream the 'Hellenic dream', was to present pictures of the ancient world, often imperfect but not entirely illusory, in a form easily accessible to the moderns. We are thus reminded by a modern of the springs from which poetry first issued, and may even hope that Heredia's successors will more and more lead us back to them.

The merit of Ronsard and the Pléiade, of Chénier, of Heredia, is that they offer so many bridges to the ancient world; or rather, as M. Desonay would rightly remind us, so many dreams of it. We at least, while dreaming, may gain something of balance and happiness in an age which has lost so much of both.

A. LYTTON SELLS.

DURHAM.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ALBALAT, A. 'Les Samedis de J.-M. de Heredia.' In *Souvenirs de la Vie littéraire*. Paris, 1920.
 ANONYMOUS. 'Our Present Discontents.' In *Times Literary Supplement*, 6 and 13 August, 1938.
Anthologie grecque, L', traduite sur le texte d'après le manuscrit palatin par Fr. Jacobs [F. Dehèque]. Paris, 1863, 2 vols.
 ARNOLD, MATTHEW. *On Translating Homer*. In *Works*, vol. v. London, 1903.

- BEAZLEY, J. D. and ASHMOLE, B. *Greek Sculpture and Painting to the end of the Hellenistic Period*. Cambridge, 1932.
- BENSON, A. C. *The Reed of Pan*. London, 1922.
- BRUNETIÈRE, F. *L'Évolution de la Poésie lyrique en France au XIXe siècle*. Paris, 1894.
- CHAMPION, E. (editor). *Le Tombeau de Louis Ménard*. Paris, 1902.
- CLERC, C. *Le Génie du Paganisme*. Paris, 1926.
- DECHARME, P. *Mythologie de la Grèce antique*. Paris, 1879.
- DESONAY, F. *Le Rêve hellénique chez les Poètes parnassiens*. Paris, 1928.
- FRANCE, A. *La Vie littéraire*, 1ère Série. Paris, n.d.
- GARDNER, P. *Principles of Greek Art*. New York, 1914.
- Greek Anthology, The*. [Edited] with an English Translation by W. R. Paton. Vols. II and III. London, 1925.
- HEREDIA, J.-M. DE. *Les Trophées*. Paris, 1893.
- HEREDIA, J.-M. DE. *L'Enlèvement d'Antiope, La Vision d'Ajazz, La Fuleuse*, and other sonnets. *Revue des deux Mondes*, 1er décembre, 1905.
- IBROVAC, M. *José-Maria de Heredia: sa vie—son œuvre*. Paris, 1923.
- IBROVAC, M. *Les Sources des 'Trophées'*. Paris, 1923.
- MACKAIL, J. W. *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*. London, 1906.
- MARTINO, P. *Parnasse et Symbolisme*. Paris, n.d.
- MÉNARD, L. *Du Polythéisme hellénique*. Paris, 1863.
- MÉNARD, L. *Lettres inédites*, ed. by H. Peyre. New Haven, 1932.
- Oxford Book of Greek Verse in Translation, The*. Edited by T. F. Higham and C. M. Bowra. Oxford, 1938.
- PEYRE, H. *Louis Ménard (1822-1901)*. New Haven, 1932.
- SOURIAU, M. *Histoire du Parnasse*. Paris, 1929.
- TARN, W. W. *Hellenistic Civilization*. London, 1930.
- THAUZIÈS, R. 'Étude sur les sources de J.-M. de Heredia.' In *Revue des Langues romanes*. Vol. LIII, 6e série, t. III, 1910, pp. 461-512; and vol. LIV, t. IV, 1911, pp. 37-66.
- VIANEY, J. 'Les Sonnets grecs de Heredia.' In *Revue des Cours et Conférences*, 29 juin et 6 juillet, 1911. Pp. 721-35 and 769-84.
- WRIGHT, F. A. *A History of later Greek Literature*. London, 1932.
- ZIELIŃSKI, TH. *The Religion of Ancient Greece*, translated by G. R. Noyes. Oxford, 1926.
- ZILLIACUS, E. 'José-Maria de Heredia et l'Anthologie grecque.' In *Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France*, 17e Année, 1910. Pp. 262-70.

'POLLY' AMONG THE PIRATES

I

THE trouble that John Gay encountered when he tried to repeat the success of *The Beggar's Opera* with its sequel, *Polly*, is well known. In November 1728 John Rich was just on the point of putting the new opera into rehearsal when word came from the Lord Chamberlain's department, 'upon an information he was rehearsing a play improper to be represented', that no further steps should be taken 'till his Grace hath seen it'.¹ On Saturday morning, 7 December, Gay waited upon the Lord Chamberlain, the Duke of Grafton.

I desir'd to have the honour of reading the Opera to his Grace, but he order'd me to leave it with him, which I did upon expectation of having it return'd on the Monday following, but I had it not 'till Thursday December 12, when I receiv'd it from his Grace with this answer; that it was not allow'd to be acted, but commanded to be suppress.²

If the play might not be publicly performed, however, it could yet be printed for the author's benefit. Little time was lost in satisfying the public's curiosity about the banning of *Polly*. On 18 March Gay was able to tell Swift:

The play is now almost printed, with the music, words, and basses, engraved on thirty-one copperplates. . . . I print the book at my own expense, in quarto, which is to be sold for six shillings, with the music.³

The handsome quarto, which was on sale about the beginning of April, came from the press of William Bowyer, who printed two large editions, 10,500 copies in all.⁴ Most of the courtiers, Gay reported, were afraid to come out in open support, 'but the city and the people of England take my part very warmly'. In the end he is said to have cleared over £1000 from the sale of *Polly*. His profit, however, would have been considerably higher if the notoriety of the play had not tempted several booksellers to pirate it, and undercut Gay's six-shilling quarto with their own octavo editions selling at a quarter of that price or less. The story of these piracies has never, I believe, been told; but it can be pieced together fairly satisfactorily from the answers of the various defendants to the bill of complaint entered by Gay in the Court of Chancery in April (?) 1729.

¹ *The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, D.D.*, ed. F. E. Ball, iv, 51.

² *Polly*, 1729. The Preface.

³ Swift, *Correspondence*, ed. cit., iv, 70, 71.

⁴ J. Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes* (1812), i, 404. According to Thomas Read, one of the defendants to the bill which Gay brought in Chancery (C 11/1272/17), the printer was John Wright.

The bill itself has disappeared; but as Gay had an advertisement inserted in *The Daily Post*, 11 April 1729, in which certain booksellers and vendors of spurious editions of *Polly* were said to be 'now under Prosecution', it seems likely that he had commenced proceedings by that date.¹ Obviously, if he was seeking an injunction, he would have to act at once. 'He has about twenty lawsuits with booksellers for pirating his book', Arbuthnot wrote to Swift on 8 May.² Arbuthnot's 'twenty' is scarcely an exaggeration. When the Court of Chancery granted Gay his injunction on 12 June 1729,³ it named the following printers and booksellers: Thomas Read, Robert Walker, J. Watson, Samuel Aris, Edward Simons, J. Noon, D. Midwinter, Robert Walker, T. Worrall, T. Woodward, J. Crockat, Edmund Curll, Henry Curll, J. Pote, Francis Jeffreys, H. Witteridge, and Anne Dodd. There may have been others. Thomas Astley was presumably cited in Gay's original bill, for he put in an answer; Jeffery Walker, whose name appeared on the title-page of one of the piracies, must almost certainly have been cited; and, in an affidavit dated 6 June, Robert Willock and Samuel Johnson were enumerated along with some of the other booksellers mentioned in the injunction as having offered copies of the pirated editions to their customers.⁴

There appear to have been at least four such editions on sale in England during April 1729.⁵

(1) *POLLY: AN OPERA. BEING THE SECOND PART OF THE BEGGAR'S OPERA.* Written by Mr. GAY...*LONDON*: Printed for T. THOMSON, and sold by the Booksellers of *London* and *Westminster*. 1729. [Price One Shilling and Sixpence.]

There were two, and probably three, separate editions with the Thomson imprint.

(2) *POLLY: AN OPERA. BEING THE SECOND PART OF THE BEGGAR'S OPERA.* Written by Mr. GAY...*LONDON*: Printed for *Jeffery Walker* in the Strand, and sold by the Booksellers of *London* and *Westminster*. [n.d.]

(3) *THE Second Part OF THE BEGGARS OPERA...LONDON*: Sold by T. READ, in *White-Fryers*, near *Fleet-street*. MDCCXIX. (Price 1s.)

To these we ought almost certainly to add an Irish edition of the same date:

POLLY: AN OPERA. BEING THE SECOND PART OF THE BEGGAR'S OPERA. Written by Mr. GAY....*DUBLIN*: Printed by S. Powell, For George Risk, George Ewing, and William Smith, Booksellers, in *Dame's-street*. MDCCXXIX.

¹ On the other hand, T. Read in his further answer, dated 10 November 1730 (C 11/1272/7 (1)), stated that he believed Gay had filed his bill on 3 June 1729.

² Swift, *Correspondence*, ed. cit., iv, 80.

³ C 33/351, f. 305. See also Charles Viner, *A General Abridgment of Law and Equity*, iv, 279.

⁴ C 41/43, no. 46.

⁵ See below, p. 293.

These several editions, together with the proceedings which were slowly unfolded in the Court of Chancery, raise several points of bibliographical interest. One startling feature is the speed with which the pirated editions were produced and put on the market. T. Read, who was in the field by 12 April, was apparently the last of the three to cash in on the popularity of *Polly*: he had set up his own edition from a copy of the Thomson octavo. Whether the Walker edition preceded the Thomson one is not clear; but as Gay was complaining on 11 April¹ of 'several spurious and incorrect Editions of POLLY', both were presumably in the market before that date, and Read stated that he had bought the Thomson edition on 8 April.² The Walker edition was advertised ('This Day is Published') in *Fog's Weekly Journal*, 12 April; but, as is well known, the words 'This Day is Published' are apt to recur in early eighteenth-century advertisements over a considerable period, and in any case we have no means of telling on what day the advertisement was handed in. I have not noted any advertisement of the Thomson edition earlier than that which appeared in *The London Evening-Post*, 12-15 April. Read's edition was advertised in *The St James's Evening Post* of 10-12 April. If he was speaking the truth when he said that he had bought the Thomson edition on 8 April and printed his own from that, he must have made his men hustle. His edition is certainly abominably printed, and bears all the marks of working against time.³ The earliest advertisement of Gay's own edition that I have found appeared in *The Whitehall Evening-Post*, 3-5 April:

*This Day is publish'd, in Quarto POLLY. AN OPERA. Being the Second Part of the BEGGAR's OPERA. Written by Mr. GAY. Printed for the Author, and Sold by Mr. Heney at Gay's Head in Tavistock-street near Covent Garden price 6s.*⁴

It seems safe to assume that the Thomson, Walker, and Read editions were set up, worked, stitched, and published in a matter of three or four days. The text of the play in the Thomson octavo runs to 62 pages; and

¹ *Daily Post*. See below, p. 299.

² C 11/1272/18.

³ In his further answer of 10 November 1730 (C11/1272/7 (1)), Read stated that 'between the eighth and eleventh of April in the Year 1729 he did at this Defendant's then printing house in White fryars aforesaid print the Edition of the book in the bill mentioned'. In quoting from Chancery documents I have expanded contracted spellings throughout this article.

⁴ It was entered in the Stationers' Register on 3 April by John Roberts, acting on behalf of the author. The date of publication, however, may have been some days earlier; for it was part of the defence of Thomas Read, James Watson, and Robert Walker that they had 'heard and believe' that some copies of *Polly* were published before Gay's title was registered in the Hall Book of the Stationers' Company, though the Act required that a book should be registered before publication. Heney was a fan-painter: Gay's decision to deal with him rather than with the trade may have been a contributory cause to the pirating of his play.

if the music plates were ready to be bound up with the text by 8 April the achievement is all the more remarkable.¹

II

The Thomson editions are for a variety of reasons the most interesting. The men chiefly responsible for this piracy were Thomas Astley, bookseller, St Paul's Churchyard, and James Watson, printer and publisher, Wardrobe Court, Great Carter Lane. Astley, who was to become a person of considerable importance in the London book trade, had a good reputation at this time, and, in spite of several unlucky encounters with the law, never really lost it. His respect for literary property was not highly developed; but among eighteenth-century booksellers he showed no more than the average willingness to take a chance where quick profits seemed likely to cover the risk.² James Watson—not to be confused with the celebrated Edinburgh printer—was a much less reputable person. His publications included such pornographical pieces as *The Adventures of the Priests and the Nuns*, *The Adventures of the Bath*, and so forth.³ Almost exactly a year before Gay brought him into Court, Watson had been arrested for his share in the printing of various seditious pamphlets. That in itself need not be to his discredit, for sedition in 1728 might involve nothing worse than making public what Walpole's Whig government preferred to keep secret. But Watson was no hero, and to save his own skin he turned informer against his fellow-printers.⁴ To this new servant of Walpole the pirating of a play written by an author who had incurred the grave displeasure of the government might almost appear in the light of a patriotic duty, and one, at least, attended with small risk to himself.

On this occasion he was acting in partnership with Astley, and sharing with him the expenses of printing. Of the two editions mentioned in their replies to Gay's bill, each partner took half of the copies printed,

¹ The 'Musick curiously engrav'd on Copper' is mentioned in the advertisement of 12-15 April (*London Evening-Post*).

² Astley was an active publisher of plays and miscellaneous literature (H. R. Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Printers and Booksellers... from 1726 to 1775*). In April 1732, in partnership with several other booksellers, he commenced publication of *The London Magazine*, a serious rival to Edward Cave's recently founded *Gentleman's Magazine*. In 1747 both Astley and Cave were brought before the House of Lords for publishing accounts of the proceedings against Simon, Lord Lovat (C. Lennart Carlson, *The First Magazine. A History of the Gentleman's Magazine*, 1938, pp. 63 ff., 104). Astley died on 28 February 1759 (J. Nichols, *Literary Anecdotes*, III, 714).

³ Plomer, *op. cit.*

⁴ L. Hanson, *Government and the Press*, 1936, p. 40.

and either sold them in his own shop or disposed of them to the trade.¹ The first edition was one of 2000 copies, and the second of 1000. To the public the price was 1s. 6d., and to the trade, 1s. Watson reckoned that he had made a profit of 4d. on every copy sold to a bookseller, and 10d. on any copy sold to a customer in his own shop. On the sale of both editions he estimated that he had made a profit of £20: Astley's estimate of his profit was only £15.² Considering the circumstances in which this estimate was given, it is perhaps right to assume that both men were likely to put the figures for their total profit as low as they decently could. Incidentally, both Watson and Astley admitted that the name 'T. Thomson' was a fictitious one to conceal the names of the real printers and publishers.³

On the printing of the Thomson editions some interesting facts were dragged to light in the answers of the various defendants. The work was done by two separate printers. In his answer to Gay's bill Samuel Aris (or Ayriss) admitted that Astley, 'a person of Good credit and reputation', came to him in April 1728, and handed him part of *Polly*—'so much as would make two Sheets in small Pica Letter'—with instructions to print 2000 copies. Aris did this job for Astley, and later in the month Astley ordered another 1000, which Aris printed for him. For the first edition Astley paid him £4. 4s. 0d., and for the second, £1. 4s. 0d., with £6. 13s. 4d. for the music plates. He never saw the book in its entirety, nor did he ever see a copy of the title-page; he was concerned only with the part that Astley gave him to print. He believed, however, that 'the beginning of the book' was printed by James Watson. This is confirmed by Astley, who states in his answer that Watson and Aris each printed a part of the two editions, and that he 'believes' that Watson drew up the title-page.

As to why the printing was shared out between Watson and Aris, the most obvious explanation is that time was an important consideration, and the division of labour between the two houses must have materially

¹ These and subsequent facts about the Thomson editions are drawn from the following documents: The Further Answer of James Watson, 11 January 1730 (C 11/1739/34 (2)), The Answer of Francis Jefferey, 4 November 1730 (C 11/2427/24 (2)), The Further Answer of James Watson, 5 November 1730 (C 11/1272/7 (2)); The Further Answer of James Watson, 15 May 1732 (C 11/2433/14); The Answer of Samuel Ayriss, 25 August, 1732 (C 11/2434/18); The Answer of Thomas Astley, 16 November 1732 (C 11/1738/35).

² Astley had sold 1263 copies at £5 per 100 to the booksellers, and about 12 more to gentlemen at 1s. 6d. a copy. He had still 213 in stock on 16 November. Both Astley and Watson estimated the cost at £2. 2s. 0d. a sheet ('the Charge of the Common Presse') or 7d. or 8d. a book with the music. When Watson filed his answer of 5 November 1730 he had sold all his share of the two editions 'excepting only thirty Coppies or thereabout'.

³ 'T. Thomson' misled Mr Plomer into attributing this piracy to 'J. Thompson, bookseller and publisher, near the Sessions-House in the old Bailey'. Plomer, *op. cit.*, p. 244.

shortened the job. But there may have been another motive. In his bill of complaint Gay had apparently suggested that the better to carry on their fraud and design Astley and Watson had caused the Thomson edition to be printed by several hands, for in his reply Astley expressly denies that there was any such intention. The denial is perhaps less significant than the fact that Gay's lawyer thought it relevant to make the accusation. After all, neither Aris nor Watson had printed Gay's *Polly*; each man, it is true, had printed a part of the play, but the Act of Anne said nothing about the unauthorized printing of *parts* of an author's work. Aris, at any rate, thought it worth his while in his answer to deny that he had printed 'all or any' of the editions mentioned in Gay's bill. The sharing out of the printing, in fact, may have been considered as a way of enabling Watson and Aris to escape the strict letter of the law. Many feebler pleas than that were advanced by eighteenth-century lawyers on behalf of their clients. For Thomas Read it was urged¹ that in his pirated edition there were alterations on every page, the title-page was different, and the music and preface had been omitted. The Court was apparently asked to draw the conclusion that whatever Read had published it was not Gay's *Polly*.

There is no copy of the Thomson piracy in the British Museum. There are two copies, however, in the Bodleian, and Mr Graham Pollard was kind enough to examine those for me and report upon them. He knew what I expected him to find, and in one of the two copies examined (Douce P. 462 (2), hereinafter called X) he found it.² In X, signatures A-E were printed by one printer, signatures F-I by another. This edition has also eight leaves of engraved music which are not present in the other; but there is probably no special significance to be attached to that, since with a publication of this kind the public was frequently given the option of buying the play with the music, or the play alone at a reduced price. (In his Answer of 12 November 1729, Watson stated that he must have sold about 100 copies without the music, and the rest with it.) Mr Pollard's examination of X had therefore confirmed the evidence of Watson and Aris, and since Aris had stated in his answer that he believed Watson had printed 'the beginning of the book', his own share in the printing was obviously signatures F-I.

Mr Pollard's examination of the second Bodleian copy (M. adds. 108 e 88 (6), hereinafter called Y) produced, however, a startling com-

¹ C 11/1272/18.

² Throughout the discussion that follows I am heavily indebted to Mr Pollard. After obscuring the problem by his disconcerting report on Y, he proceeded to clarify it in our subsequent correspondence.

plication. Instead of being the work of two different printers, it was printed throughout by the same printer. Comparison of Y with X showed that the printer of Y was the printer of signatures A-E of X, that is, Watson. Both editions have the same identically damaged P in 'Polly' on the title-page, and both make use of the same ornament and woodblock on A₃ verso and B₂ recto; but signatures A-E in X and Y are different settings of type throughout.¹ The most natural explanation is probably the correct one—that Watson had double-crossed his partner. He had admitted to printing, in partnership with Astley, 2000 copies of his part of *Polly*, and later a further 1000 copies. What he had not admitted, and what presumably Astley did not know, was that he had printed for his own use, at some time unknown, a further edition of the entire play. If Watson was in fact double-crossing his partner, he was taking a considerable risk; for if Mr Pollard could distinguish between X and Y, Astley (whose interests were, after all, not merely academic) might also have noticed the discrepancy. But Astley was a bookseller rather than a printer, and Watson may have counted on his piracy deceiving all but the expert, as, indeed, it appears to have done for over 200 years.

One further piece of bibliographical evidence must be taken into account. In examining X and Y Mr Pollard found that the block on B₂ recto of X showed signs of deterioration. The natural inference is that Y (the edition printed throughout by Watson) preceded X (Watson and Aris); and that is an inference which it is difficult to accept. But the difficulty is more apparent than real. There is no need to assume that the sheets last printed were necessarily the last to be gathered; indeed, the opposite is more likely to be true. Obviously the sheets showing the most marked deterioration in the block on B₂ recto would be lying on the top of the pile, since they were the last to be printed. When Aris's man arrived at Watson's warehouse with his 1000 copies of signatures F-I it might easily happen that these would be gathered with the most recently printed copies of Watson's A-E. When the 1000 copies of Aris's F-I were exhausted, Watson would then continue gathering his own printing of F-I with what was left of his own printing of A-E; and what was left of his

¹ Mr Pollard writes: 'It would not be easy to give precise criteria to identify signatures A-E of X and Y in other copies, in spite of the fact that they are differently set throughout. But it may be useful to note that on C₂ recto (p. 9) X has two more lines of type than Y, and ends "—entiously, and set the lowest Price upon my Ladies; when". This difference increases up to D₄ recto (p. 21), where X begins at the top of the page: "Mrs. Duc. Her Manner and Behaviour are so particular," which occurs ten lines from the top of p. 21 in Y. Thereafter the gap narrows to eight lines; and both come together with the end of Act I on E₁ recto' (p. 23).

A-E would most probably be those sheets that had been run off his press first. Obviously such conjectures could be put forward more confidently if they were based on an examination of more than two copies, but owing to restrictions caused by the war it has not been possible to examine any others.

To sum up: Any reconstruction of what had been going on in Watson's shop must be conjectural; but on the evidence available something of this sort appears to have taken place.¹ Gay's own edition of *Polly* is on sale (3-5 April). Astley procures a copy, takes it to Samuel Aris, and gives him instructions to compose a specified part of the book (3-5 April). Aris starts printing 2000 copies of four half-sheets, and Watson is at work on 2000 copies of the remaining four half-sheets. Printing is completed in two days,² and gathering and sewing begun (6-7 April). The first copies of the Thomson edition are now on sale (8 April?). Gathering and sewing continue. Astley and Watson, finding that their cheap edition is having a brisk sale, decide to print a further 1000 copies. Astley places an order with Aris for another thousand copies of signatures F-I. (Since Aris charged only £1. 4s. 0d. for the second impression of 1000, his type had presumably remained standing.) Watson begins to reset signatures A-E. But Watson now thinks that there may be a sale for still more than the further 1000 copies which he and Astley had agreed to publish, and he accordingly overprints signatures A-E by an unspecified number of copies. At the same time, or shortly after, he sets one of his own men to print a supply of signatures F-I, which will be additional to those which are expected from Aris.³ By this procedure Watson would not make much profit, but he would make some. He would have an unestimated number of additional copies of signatures A-E for the cost of paper and machining. He would have to bear the sole cost of printing his additional copies of signatures F-I; on the other hand, he would not have to share his profit with Astley. That Watson should consider himself in a fair way to make additional profit so late in the day—by this

¹ In this reconstruction I am again much indebted to Mr Pollard.

² This calculation is based on the assumption that both printers had two presses available.

³ Alternatively, of course, Watson may have decided to put out a surreptitious edition of his own, and may have printed it off, *before* Astley came to him with the suggestion for a second edition of their joint piracy. In that case the order would be: (1) Astley-Watson (2000 copies), (2) Watson alone (? copies), (3) Astley-Watson (1000 copies). If the Bodleian copy of X which Mr Pollard examined belonged to the second Astley-Watson edition, there would be good reason, on this hypothesis, for the deterioration of the block on B₂ recto. Or again, there is the possibility that Watson went halves with Astley in all three editions, and that for some reason—perhaps because Aris had by that time distributed his type—they agreed to have the whole of one edition (on this hypothesis it would have to be their third) printed by Watson. When it comes to guessing, one guess is just about as good as another.

time, presumably, the Read and Walker editions were also in the field—is a striking tribute to the popularity of *Polly*.

Astley's share in the Thomson piracy placed him in an awkward situation some weeks later. He was one of several booksellers who were approached on Gay's behalf and invited to dispose of the unsold copies of the author's edition. What had happened is revealed in part by an advertisement inserted in the *Daily Post*, 11 April, 1729.

Several spurious and incorrect Editions of POLLY, an OPERA, having been publish'd and dispers'd, for which the Booksellers and Venders are now under Prosecution, and an underhand Sale of the same still continuing, the PROPRIETOR of the true genuine and correct Copy finds himself necessarily obliged to dispose of his Impression at a great Loss; so that the only true correct and genuine Edition of POLLY, an OPERA, being the Second Part of the BEGGARS OPERA, with the Ars and Bases curiously engraven on Copper, and printed in Quarto, written by Mr. GAY, is now to be sold at TWO SHILLINGS and SIX PENCE, by Robert Gosling in Fleet-street, John Stagg in Westminster Hall, John Clark at the Royal Exchange, Daniel Browne without Temple Bar, and Tho. Astley in St Paul's Church-yard.

Similar advertisements in *The London Evening-Post* and *The Whitehall Evening-Post*, 10/12 April, mention those booksellers again, but add the names of William Innys, E. Nutt, and A. Dodd. Gay's agent with the booksellers on this occasion was his friend John Barber, the bookseller who in 1733 became Lord Mayor of London. Astley, if we are to believe his own story, was no sooner informed by Barber of Gay's right to *Polly* (he must have known that all along) than he stopped selling the Thomson edition and did all he could to further the sale of Gay's quarto. On 21 July he had paid over to John Stagg £12. 6s. 0d., a sum which represented the sale of 123 copies of the quarto at 2s. a copy. He believed that he also paid over some further sum of money to Stagg at a later date. Astley admitted to Barber that he had already sold some copies of the Thomson edition, whereupon Barber 'to the best of this Defendant's now remembrance' promised on behalf of Gay that if Astley 'would permitt his Name to the Sale of the said Book of the Complainant's Edition to be Advertised And would Endeavour to promote the Sale of the same that no prosecution whatever should be sett on foot' against him. That, Astley claimed, was precisely what he had done. He had promoted the sale by laying them on his counter publicly 'and Sticking them in his Window in order to expose them to Sale in the best manner', and by refusing on many occasions since to sell the Thomson edition.

Barber's choice of booksellers to handle the sale of Gay's quarto at a remainder price is significant. He was a business man, and faced with the task of saving something from the wreck he probably went straight to those booksellers who were most actively pushing the sale of the

Thomson piracy. Mrs Anne Dodd,¹ who is continually turning up in troubles of this sort, had admitted to Gay himself some time in April that she had already sold a considerable number of the Jeffery Walker edition.² Gay had presumably walked into her pamphlet shop at the Peacock without Temple Bar and challenged her with it. Of the other booksellers named in Gay's advertisements as selling the quarto at a reduced price, three—Astley, Clarke, and Staggs—were the defendants almost exactly one month later to a suit brought by Lawton Gilliver on almost exactly the same grounds.³ The fourth defendant to Gilliver's suit was, significantly enough, James Watson. Gilliver charged those four men with having published an unauthorized edition of *The Dunciad*, on the title-page it was said to be 'Printed for A. Dob', and A. Dob was no less fictitious than T. Thomson. Barber, therefore, fully aware of the law's delays and realizing the necessity of forestalling the steady traffic in the various pirated editions, appears to have taken the sensible course of guaranteeing to at least some of the dishonest booksellers a reasonable return for acting honestly. This course of action may not have placated the angry author, but it at least saved for him some of the profits of the play which he had composed 'with great labour and study'.

III

Jeffery Walker's answer, if he ever filed one, is missing; and the two answers⁴ put in by his brother, Robert Walker, are admirably non-committal, and add little to our knowledge. Robert Walker, 'keeping a Shop and selling the Books and pamphletts that come out Daily', admitted that he had sold some copies of the Walker edition. He admitted, too, that his brother having decided to print *Polly*—or, as he more reticently put it—'a Book of the Same Name mentioned in the Complainant's said Bill'—he was his security with the printers. The most interesting feature of the Walker edition, however, is the way in which the price was adjusted to meet the new situation when Barber took control of the sale of the quarto. Undercut by both the Thomson and the Walker editions, Gay, as has already been noted, allowed the quarto to be sold at half a crown. But two could play at that game. In *The St James's Evening Post*, 17/19 April, a new advertisement for the Walker

¹ She was, incidentally, the ostensible publisher of *The Dunciad* of 1728, and of *The Dunciad Variorum*, 1729. See 'The Dunciad of 1729', *Modern Language Review*, xxxi, 347 ff.

² C 41/43, no. 47.

³ 'The Dunciad of 1729', *Modern Language Review*, xxxi, 347 ff.

⁴ 12 November 1729 (C 11/1739/34); 23 December 1733 (C 11/1272/15).

edition was inserted, and the price had now been lowered to 1s. The reason was duly stated:

N.B. This Pamphlet was last Week sold for 1s. 6d. but as the Author of the Quarto Edition has thought fit to fall his Price, it is thought proper by the Proprietor of this Edition to fall his, and the Town may be assured that there is not a Word Difference between this Edition and the Quarto Edition.

In the eyes of Jeffery Walker, it will be noted, Gay was not so much the author of *Polly* as 'the Author of the Quarto Edition'—'the boasted Quarto Edition', as one of the advertisements for the Thomson piracy irreverently describes it.¹

IV

From T. Read's various answers² it appears that his edition was one of 500 copies. When Gay filed his bill Read had still 157 copies in hand, but he managed to dispose of another seven after being served with the process to answer Gay's bill. Some he sold for 1s., others for 9d., and others for 8d. He had 'made waste paper' of the 150 that still remained after that. Printing costs he estimated at 26s. a sheet, or 6d. a book. Taking into account the charges of printing, advertising, etc., he reckoned that he was actually a loser on the 350 copies that he had managed to sell. Further, he repudiated the suggestion that he had sold his edition at 1s. 'the better to suppress the Sale of the Book printed for the Complainant but only to get some small Profit to himself by the Sales of such Edition'. As we have seen he had set up his edition from a copy of the Thomson one which he bought on 8 April; and, as 'Thomson' had already printed the play, Read 'thought he might as well do it as others and thereby was induced to Print the same'.³ After the appearance of the Thomson edition, Read was optimistic enough to believe—or so he informed the Court—that 'the Complainant might be Unwilling to take the Advantage of the Act of Parliament in the Bill mentioned and Leave it to the World to Publish his Works'.

In asserting that he had 'made waste paper' of the 150 copies which remained unsold from his edition of 500, Read was making a statement

¹ According to Mr Plomer (op. cit. p. 252), Walker was 'notorious for his pirated editions'. Several are listed.

² 12 November 1729 (C 11/1739/34); 26 October 1730 (C 11/1272/18); 10 November 1730 (C 11/1272/7 (1)); 17 May 1732 (C 11/1272/17). Thomas Read, Dogwell Court, Whitefriars, Fleet Street, published numerous pamphlets, and some books of good repute such as Robert Seymour's edition of Stow's *Survey of London and Westminster* (Plomer, op. cit., p. 208).

³ This was precisely the explanation put forward in James Watson's answer of 5 November 1730; viz. '... not having any such manner of Notice So as to forbid him from printing the said Book and finding that the same had been printed before viz. by the said T. Read and Jeffery Walker He thought he might as well do it as others'. Either Watson or Read was lying, it was almost certainly Watson, but it is of little matter which.

that the Court of Chancery would have found it difficult to verify. His claim to have destroyed those copies ought, perhaps, to be considered along with a rather puzzling denial¹ that he had printed any of the 'additions' to the several editions printed. If we had Gay's original bill we should no doubt know what those 'additions' were; they do not seem to be additions to the text of the play (Read's changes in the text mostly took the form of omissions), and it is therefore a reasonable guess that Gay had complained to the Court that more copies of the pirated editions had been printed than Astley, Watson, Walker, and Read had been prepared to admit. Support for this interpretation comes from an unexpected quarter. There is in the possession of Professor Nichol Smith an undated 'second edition' of *Polly*, bound up with a number of other eighteenth century plays.

POLLY: AN OPERA. BEING THE SECOND PART OF THE BEGGAR'S OPERA. Written by Mr. GAY. The SECOND EDITION. LONDON: Printed for THO. ASTLEY, at the Rose in Pater-noster-Row. [Price Eighteen-Pence.]

This particular copy may have been remaindered, for the published price has been crossed out, and 'One Shilling' substituted in ink. In describing this copy to me Professor Nichol Smith had remarked that the paper of the title-page appeared to be whiter than that of the rest of the pamphlet; and as this naturally aroused my suspicions, he kindly forwarded the play to me for examination. The fact that the running title was not *Polly*, but *The Second Part of the BEGGARS OPERA*, led me to believe that the play might turn out to be a copy of Read's piracy with a new title-page. Comparison with the Read piracy in the British Museum proved beyond any doubt that this was so: Astley had procured copies of Read's piracy, and was offering them to the public as a second edition.

What is to be made of this fresh complication? Not, surely, that Astley had grown bolder in his piracy, and from publishing an edition attributed to the non-existent T. Thomson proceeded to acquire copies of Read's piracy and to publish them as a (pirated) second edition which he had the impudence to acknowledge. After Gay had filed his bill in Chancery such conduct would seem to be incredible, nor does it square with the facts given in Astley's answer. The existence of this 'second edition' seems rather to confirm Astley's claim that after Barber had negotiated with him on the author's behalf he ceased acting against Gay's interests, and came to an understanding with him. That understanding may, or may not, have involved the payment to Gay of a sum

¹ In his *Further Answer*, 26 October 1730 (C 11/1272/18).

of money for the right to sell any copies of the pirated editions of *Polly* that he might still have to dispose of or that he could acquire, in addition to those copies of the author's edition that he was now selling at half a crown. But one may suppose that Astley had now some kind of right or title to set his name on the title-page of *Polly*, and that in the exercise of that right he compelled Read to hand over to him, or got Read to sell to him, the copies that still remained from his pirated octavo. In that case Read had either not destroyed the 150 copies which he told the Court were now waste paper, or he had printed more than the 500 copies mentioned in his Answer. And if Astley was prepared to clap a new title-page on the Read octavo and sell it as a second edition, he may have done the same thing with unsold copies of the Thomson and Jeffery Walker octavos. It is possible that copies of the 'second edition' may yet come to light which carry the same title-page as the copy belonging to Professor Nichol Smith, but have the text of the Thomson or Walker piracies. In any case, it seems unlikely that Astley would trouble to publish a second edition unless he had a considerable number of copies in hand.

V

As already stated, Gay obtained his injunction on 12 June 1729. On his death, in December 1732, his suit was still dragging its way through the Court of Chancery. His two sisters, Catherine Baller and Joanna Fortescue, on whom the property devolved, entered a Bill of Reviver against the various defendants. Robert Walker was answering this as late as 23 December 1733. At length, on 6 December 1737, the lawyers 'ceased their funning', and the two ladies were granted a perpetual injunction.¹ True to tradition, the Court of Chancery was elaborately locking the stable door after the horse had escaped. By 1737 it is unlikely that anyone in the London book trade cared very much what happened to *Polly*.

JAMES R. SUTHERLAND.

LONDON.

¹ Sir William Blackstone, *Commentaries on the Laws of England, Book the Second* (1766), p. 407. It is fortunate that Blackstone recorded the conclusion of Gay's suit, for I had not completed a search through Decrees and Orders when war broke out.

SHAKESPEARE'S 'HENRY IV' AND THE WAVERLEY NOVELS

HENRY IV served Scott well and in many ways. He found there a way of presenting history in a series of lively scenes. The blank verse gave him a model for the dignified speech of his kings and nobles. The Falstaff set showed him what could be done with secondary, non-historical figures. He drew help from the play for characters and situations. For the most part he borrows nobly, as only a great writer can. *Henry IV* did for him what good sherris-sack did for Falstaff. It made his imagination 'apprehensive, quick, forgetive, full of nimble, fiery and delectable shapes'.

When rebellion is being planned or is actually afoot in the Waverley Novels—and that is not seldom—Scott's thoughts are likely to turn to the historical plays, and in particular to *Henry IV*. There he found expressed the passions and hopes of those who plot

to pluck a kingdom down
And set another up.

Hotspur helped Scott to draw some of his Jacobite and other adventurers, victims of 'ill-weav'd ambition'. Fergus MacIvor is a good example. His sister's remark (*Waverley*, ch. 26) that he 'wooed no bride but Honour' recalls Hotspur's speech about honour in *I Henry IV*, I, iii, 201-8. In their military exercises (ch. 19) Fergus's men 'exhibited a sort of mock encounter, in which the charge, the rally, the flight, the pursuit, and all the current of a heady fight, were exhibited to the sound of the great war bagpipe'. This echoes Lady Percy's description of her husband murmuring 'tales of iron wars' in his sleep:

And thou hast talk'd
Of salles and retires, of trenches, tents,
Of palisadoes, frontiers, parapets,
Of basilisks, of cannon, culverin,
Of prisoners' ransom, and of soldiers slain,
And all the currents of a heady fight.¹

Marching south after the taking of Carlisle, Fergus, 'all air and fire, and confident against the world in arms, measured nothing but that every step was a yard nearer London'.² Scott is thinking of Prince Hal's declaration on the eve of Shrewsbury that

The Douglas and the Hotspur both together
Are confident against the world in arms.³

¹ *I H. IV*, II, iii, 55-60.

² *Waverley*, ch. 57.

³ *I H. IV*, V, i, 116-17. 'All air and fire' is probably from *Henry V*, III, vii, 22: 'He is pure air and fire', referring to the Dauphin's horse on the eve of Agincourt.

The amused but impatient attitude of Fergus towards Baron Bradwardine (e.g. ch. 48) was, no doubt, suggested by Hotspur's treatment of Glendower. But it is also clear that the Baron derives, not from Glendower, but from another Welshman. 'I could almost apply to Mr Bradwardine', says Waverley (ch. 46), 'the character which Henry gives of Fluellen.'¹

Redgauntlet, like Fergus, is drawn after Hotspur. But his first appearance, riding on the Solway sands, recalls not Hotspur but Prince Hal. 'He was a tall man, well mounted on a strong black horse, which he caused to turn and wind like a bird in the air, carried a longer spear than the others, and wore a sort of fur cap or bonnet, with a short feather in it.'² This description, it seems very probable, is coloured by Scott's recollection of Vernon's lines about Prince Hal and his comrades:

All furnish'd, all in arms,
All plum'd like estridges that wing the wind.
I saw young Harry, with his beaver on,
His cuisses on his thighs, gallantly arm'd,
Rise from the ground like feather'd Mercury,
And vaulted with such ease into his seat,
As if an angel dropp'd down from the clouds,
To turn and wind a fiery Pegasus
And witch the world with noble horsemanship.³

The chief clue is, of course, 'turn and wind'. It is worth noting that in *Woodstock* (ch. 25) Sir Henry Lee recites this 'celebrated passage', as Scott calls it.⁴

Just before his great venture (ch. 17), Redgauntlet says to Darsie Latimer: 'We have that before us which will brook no delay from

¹ In ch. 4 Waverley 'sometimes cursed in his heart the jargon of heraldry... with all the bitterness of Hotspur himself'. In *Castle Dangerous*, ch. 18, Greenleaf listens to the minstrel, 'subduing his Hotspur-like disposition to tire of the recitation'. In *The Antiquary*, ch. 19, Hector M'Intyre, irritated with Oldbuck, admits, 'I have something of Hotspur in me'. In *St Ronan's Well*, ch. 8, Mowbray, rebuked by Lady Penelope, replies in Hotspur's words: 'Well—good manners be my speed!', though we are told (ch. 23) that he never reads Shakespeare. This does not prevent Scott using a favourite tag.

One or two other references to *Henry IV* in *Waverley* may be given. The motto for the novel is from *II H. IV*. The logic of Waverley's father about war is compared to Falstaff's (ch. 5). Flora addresses Waverley (ch. 26), who is not yet a Jacobite, in Hotspur's words to Sir Walter Blunt (*I H. IV*, iv, iii, 36-7):

'Because you are not of our quality
But stand against us as an enemy.'

² *Redgauntlet*, Letter 4.

³ *I H. IV*, iv, i, 97-110.

⁴ Other riding passages in the plays were also favourites. The lines about the horseman (*II H. IV*, i, 1, 43-8) are either quoted or echoed in *The Antiquary*, ch. 40; *Woodstock*, ch. 32; *St Ronan's Well*, ch. 34. Northumberland's words about the lords of Ross and Willoughby. 'Bloody with spurring, fiery-red with haste' (*R. II*, ii, iii, 58) are quoted in *The Antiquary*, ch. 9; *Ivanhoe*, ch. 34; *The Monastery*, ch. 36.

306 *Shakespeare's 'Henry IV' and the Waverley Novels*

indisposition: we have not, as Hotspur says, leisure to be sick.' This combines a speech of Hotspur's and one of Worcester's:

'Zounds! how has he the leisure to be sick
In such a justling time?

and

The quality and hair of our attempt
Brooks no division.¹

Hotspur's words are prompted by a discouraging letter; Redgauntlet receives such a letter just after his declaration. Both men show the same determination to go ahead in spite of bad news. 'Come, let me taste my horse', exclaims Hotspur. 'My horse—my horse!' commands Redgauntlet. So readily do Scott's thoughts turn to the play in this part of the novel that even into Cristal Nixon's mouth (ch. 19) he slips one of Hotspur's phrases: 'So, my young cock of the North,' says Cristal scornfully to the cautious Darsie, 'you now know it all, and no doubt are blessing your uncle for stirring you up to such an honourable action.' This, of course, is from Hotspur's comment on his timid correspondent: 'O! I could divide myself and go to buffets, for moving such a dish of skim milk with so honourable an action.'²

In the excellent scene at Joe Crackenthorp's public house (ch. 22) where Redgauntlet and the other conspirators debate the chances of success, Scott was once again thinking of the similar discussion in *I Henry IV*, iv, i. There is little in the way of verbal echo, and the scene is none the worse for that. But one remark by Sir Richard Glendale is very revealing. 'In troth', he says, 'it (i.e. that the Prince should lead the insurrection) is the very keystone of our enterprise.' We know now, if we had not known before, what is helping Scott's imagination. Hotspur, hearing of his father's illness, bursts out:

Sick now! droop now! this sickness doth infect
The very life-blood of our enterprise.

These words and a line from Hotspur's next speech,

A perilous gash, a very limb lopp'd off,³

frequently come to Scott's memory when he has in hand a situation in the least like that in Shakespeare. In *The Talisman* (ch. 6) Thomas de Vaux tells King Richard: 'Your illness mars the mainspring of their enterprise.' Later, in the same novel (ch. 20), when Richard has sentenced

¹ *I H. IV*, iv, i, 17-18, 61-2.

² *I H. IV*, ii, iii, 36-9. In *Ivanhoe*, ch. 18, Cedric, attempting to rouse the sluggish Athelstane in the cause of Saxon independence, has 'reason, every now and then, to lament, like Hotspur, that he should have moved such a dish of skimmed milk to so honourable an action'.

³ *I H. IV*, iv, i, 28-9, 43.

Kenneth to death, Edith declares that he has 'lopped from this enterprise one goodly limb'. In *The Betrothed* (ch. 18), Archbishop Baldwin asserts that De Lacy's delay in joining the crusade will be 'a death-blow to our holy and most gallant enterprise', and that he is 'a main prop of our enterprise'. In *Ivanhoe* (ch. 30) the dying Front-de-Bœuf is described as 'a powerful limb lopped off Prince John's enterprise'; and later (ch. 34), again in reference to Prince John's plot, we are told that 'their enterprise was delayed by the absence of more than one main limb of the confederacy'. It has been noted earlier that Scott used the language of *Henry IV* in reference also to the other conspiracy in *Ivanhoe*, that of Cedric against the Normans. In *The Abbot* (ch. 10) Magdalen Graeme laments the death of the Abbot Eustatius as 'a perilous blow to our enterprise'.¹ In *The Black Dwarf* (ch. 13), in the discussion of a rising in favour of James VIII, Ellieslaw exclaims: 'Why, this affects the very mainspring of our enterprise' ('affects' from Shakespeare's 'infect').

This scene in *The Black Dwarf* is far inferior to the corresponding scene in *Redgauntlet*. It is imitated from rather than inspired by *Henry IV*. Mareschal acts the part of Hotspur.² When some of the conspirators fail to turn up, he rouses the spirits of the rest in good Hotspur style: 'If we have gone forward like fools, do not let us go back like cowards.³ We have done enough to draw upon us both the suspicion and vengeance of the government.' This is the same argument as Hotspur uses:

There is no qualling now
Because the king is certainly possess'd
Of all our purposes.⁴

Later, the chief conspirators retire into a separate apartment. Then Mareschal produces a letter which contains the news that the French fleet with James VIII on board has been driven off by the English. This letter corresponds to the one Hotspur is reading at the beginning of *I Henry IV*, II, iii, and also to the letters brought to him in IV, i. Scott has both scenes in mind. It is now that Ellieslaw exclaims: 'Why, this

¹ The terms Scott applies to Magdalen Graeme in contrasting her with the timid Abbess (ch. 12) would fit Hotspur: 'The abbess, timid, narrow-minded, and discontented clung to ancient usages and pretensions. . . while the fiery and more lofty spirit of her companion suggested a wider field of effort, and would not be limited by ordinary rules in the extraordinary schemes which were suggested by her bold and irregular imagination.'

² Mareschal quotes *H. IV* in ch. 12. The motto for ch. 13 is from *I H. IV*, V, 1:

'To face the garment of rebellion
With some fine colour, that may please the eye
Of fickle changelings and poor discontents,
Which gape and rub the elbow at the news
Of hurlyburly innovation.'

³ One of the conspirators in the *Redgauntlet* scene says: 'If we have been fools, do not let us be cowards.'

⁴ *I H. IV*, IV, 1, 39-41; cf. also V, 11, 4-25.

affects the very mainspring of our enterprise.' Sir Frederick Langley orders his horses, and Mareschal accuses him of intending to inform the government. This is exactly what Hotspur says about the cowardly letter-writer. 'Ha! you shall see now in very sincerity of fear and cold heart, will he to the king and lay open all our proceedings.'¹

Sometimes Hotspur is recalled when there is little enough resemblance between him and Scott's character. It does not take much to send Scott's thoughts to *Henry IV*. Balfour of Burley in *Old Mortality* has certainly not much in common with Hotspur; but both have heavy business in hand, and both are impatient of delay and compromise. When Henry Morton goes to waken Balfour in the hay-loft (ch. 6), 'a ray of light streamed on his uncurtained couch, and showed to Morton the working of his harsh features, which seemed agitated by some strong internal cause of disturbance... The perspiration stood on his brow "like bubbles in a late disturbed stream", and these marks of emotion were accompanied with broken words which escaped from him at intervals.' The sleeping Balfour watched by Morton recalled to Scott Lady Percy's description of her husband:

Thy spirit within thee hath been so at war,
And that hath so bestirr'd thee in thy sleep,
That beads of sweat have stood upon thy brow,
Like bubbles in a late-disturbed stream.²

The same speech is echoed in *Ivanhoe* (ch. 28). After his fall in the lists Ivanhoe is taken to the house of Isaac. There, watched anxiously by Rebecca as Hotspur is by Lady Percy, he comes to his senses. 'A sense of wounds and injury, joined to great weakness and exhaustion, was mingled with the recollection of blows dealt and received, of steeds rushing upon each other, overthrowing and overthrown, of shouts and clashing of arms, and all the heady tumult of a confused fight.'³

¹ *I H. IV*, II, iii, 34-6. The scene in *A Legend of Montrose* (ch. 8) of the Highland chiefs planning to rise under the leadership of Montrose has a motto from the same speech, but there is no close resemblance between the scene and *Henry IV*.

² *I H. IV*, II, iii, 61-4. The motto for this chapter in *Old Mortality*:

'Yea, this man's brow, like to a tragic leaf
Foretells the nature of a tragic volume',

is from Northumberland's speech about the messenger in *II H. IV*, I, i, 60-1. Northumberland's speech continues:

'So looks the strand, whereon the imperious flood
Hath left a witness'd usurpation.'

Scott does not use these two lines in his motto, but he paraphrases them in describing Balfour near the beginning of the chapter. 'His brow was that of one in whom some strong o'ermastering principle has overwhelmed all other passions and feelings, like the swell of a high springtide, when the usual cliffs and breakers vanish from the eye, and their existence is only indicated by the chafing foam of the waves that burst and wheel over them.'

³ Cf. 'And all the currents of a heady fight', *I H. IV*, II, iii, 60.

With these two certain reminiscences of the speech in mind, one can scarcely doubt that Scott was again thinking of it in *Peveril of the Peak* (ch. 29). Like Balfour, Edward Christian is playing a dangerous game. After a disturbing interview with Bridgenorth he 'saw that his undertaking was attended with a thousand perils, and the drops stood like beads on his brow'.¹

Rob Roy has no Hotspur, nor any scene closely modelled on *Henry IV*. But in the novel as in the play men are trying to turn the world upside down by civil war, and, like both parts of *Henry IV*, the novel ends with the failure of rebellion. With such a story to tell Scott could not forget *Henry IV*. Diana Vernon tells us (ch. 10) that Sir Richard Vernon 'slain at Shrewsbury, and sorely slandered by a sad fellow called Will Shakespeare', is her ancestor. Rob Roy, says Scott in his Introduction, was on the side of the Jacobites 'upon Falstaff's principle, that, since the king wanted men and the rebels soldiers, it were worse shame to be idle in such a stirring world than to embrace the worst side, were it as black as rebellion could make it'. The robbery of Morris is not much like the robbery in *I Henry IV*, and Francis Osbaldistone tells Morris (ch. 3) that the days of 'the mad Prince and Poins' are long past. But the chapter concerning the arrest of Francis (ch. 7) has for motto: 'The sheriff, with a monstrous watch, is at the door',² and Squire Inglewood, the magistrate, who is surely cousin to Justice Shallow, tells Francis that he is 'not the first bully-boy that has said stand to a true man'.³ Rashleigh says Morris has 'the courage of the wrathful dove or most magnanimous mouse'. This is Falstaff's gibe at Francis Feeble: 'Thou wilt be as valiant as the wrathful dove or most magnanimous mouse.'⁴

The suggested comparison between Hotspur and Balfour of Burley which has already been mentioned is not the only trace of *Henry IV* in *Old Mortality*. Like *Rob Roy*, it is a tale of civil war and ends with the defeat of the insurgents. When the placid life of Tillietudlem is disturbed by the arrival of Sergeant Bothwell and his men (ch. 9), Scott remembers the scene (*II Henry IV*, v. i) in which Shallow proudly entertains 'the man of war', Falstaff. 'You shall not away to-night', says Shallow to Sir John. 'One thing you must promise me,' says Lady Margaret to

¹ In a letter to Southey (31 January 1809) Scott uses Lady Percy's speech to describe his own feelings about the war in Spain. 'I spent a most disordered and agitated night, never closing my eyes but what I was harassed with visions of broken ranks, bleeding soldiers, dying horses—"and all the currents of a heady fight".'

² *I H. IV*, II, iv. 537-8.

³ Cf. 'This is the most omnipotent villain that ever cried "Stand!" to a true man.' *I H. IV*, I, ii. 120-2.

⁴ *II H. IV*, III, ii. 172-4.

310 *Shakespeare's 'Henry IV' and the Waverley Novels*

Bothwell, 'remain at Tillietudlem to-night.' Lady Margaret's hospitality is like Shallow's; Bothwell and Falstaff both have a merry night of drinking. Old Gudyll, Lady Margaret's butler, 'associated himself with a party so much to his taste, pretty much as Davy, in the Second Part of Henry the Fourth, mingles in the revels of his master Justice Shallow'. Major Bellenden's stout-hearted preparations to defend Tillietudlem (ch. 19) suggest the chapter-motto: 'Why, then, say an old man can do somewhat.'¹ These are the words of Master Silence after drinking off his bumper in Shallow's garden. Scott is not suggesting any likeness between the Major and Silence; but he is still thinking, as in the earlier chapter, of how stirring national events break in upon the quietness of Tillietudlem as they do upon Shallow's house in Gloucestershire. The dragoons sent out by Major Bellenden to collect supplies for Tillietudlem 'abused the Major's press for stores pretty much as Sir John Falstaff did that of the king for men'.² The chapter in which this sentence occurs discusses, among other matters, the strength of the rebels and their preparations to meet the royal army. The chapter-motto,

The king hath drawn
The special head of all the land together,

is from *I Henry IV*, iv, iv, a scene in which the Archbishop of York and Sir Michael speak of the ability of Hotspur's forces

To wage an instant trial with the king.

Of far more importance than these scattered hints and references throughout *Old Mortality* is the scene just before the battle of Bothwell Bridge. Here we have an excellent example of Scott at work with *Henry IV* at his elbow. Henry Morton and Poundtext draw up (ch. 27) 'a memorial of the grievances of the Moderate Presbyterians... Their petition proceeded to require that a free parliament should be called for settling the affairs of Church and State, and for redressing the injuries sustained by the subject; and that all those who either now were or had been in arms for obtaining those ends should be indemnified.' The petition is to be sent to the Duke of Monmouth, 'to whom Charles had entrusted the charge of subduing this rebellion... and invested by the king with full powers to take measures for quieting the disturbances in Scotland.' Morton gives the memorial (ch. 28) to Lord Evandale, an officer in the royal army, to present to Monmouth: 'this humble petition and remonstrance, containing the grievances which have occasioned this

¹ *II H. IV*, v, iii, 80-1. Sir Henry Lee applies the same words to himself in *Woodstock*, ch. 25.

² Ch. 26.

insurrection, a redress of which being granted, I will answer with my head that the great body of the insurgents will lay down their arms.' On the eve of battle (ch. 30), while Morton, Balfour and others are in debate, 'they were interrupted by intelligence that the Duke of Monmouth had commenced his march towards the west'. It is decided to send Morton as an envoy to Monmouth. On his way he falls in with the royal army 'marching in great order towards Bothwell Muir, an open common, on which they proposed to encamp for that evening, at the distance of scarcely two miles from the Clyde, on the farther side of which the army of the insurgents was encamped'. The next morning, while being conducted to Monmouth, Morton 'had an opportunity of estimating the force which had been assembled for the suppression of the hasty and ill-concerted insurrection'.

Monmouth, with Dalzell and Claverhouse at his side, receives Morton, who reminds the Duke of the petition delivered by Lord Evandale. Some of the proposals, says Monmouth, 'appear to me reasonable and just; and, although I have no express injunctions from the King upon the subject, yet I assure you, Mr Morton, and I pledge my honour, that I will interpose in your behalf, and use my utmost influence to procure you satisfaction from his Majesty. But you must distinctly understand that I can only treat with supplicants, not with rebels; and, as a preliminary to every act of favour on my side, I must insist upon your followers laying down their arms and dispersing themselves.' On Morton's refusal to accept this condition, Monmouth breaks off the conference, but promises to delay the attack for an hour to allow Morton to consult the other insurgent leaders. 'If they please to disperse their followers, lay down their arms, and send a peaceful deputation to me, I will consider myself bound in honour to do all I can to procure redress of their grievances.'

The battle follows, and the pursuit and slaughter of the insurgents. Finally (ch. 32), Monmouth orders Dalzell to cease the pursuit. 'Sheathe your sword, I command you, General! and sound the retreat. Enough of blood has been shed; give quarter to the king's misguided subjects.' The execution of captured Covenanters follows in chapters 35 and 36.

Place these pages of *Old Mortality* beside the fourth act of *II Henry IV*. A messenger enters (sc. i) and reports to the Archbishop of York, Mowbray and Hastings the approach of the king's army:

West of this forest, scarcely off a mile,
In goodly form comes on the enemy;
And, by the ground they hide, I judge their number
Upon or near the rate of thirty thousand.

312 *Shakespeare's 'Henry IV' and the Waverley Novels*

Westmoreland, an emissary from the king's army, enters and rebukes the archbishop for joining in rebellion. The archbishop replies:

I have in equal balance justly weigh'd
What wrongs our arms may do, what wrongs we suffer,
And find our griefs heavier than our offences.

And have the summary of all our griefs,
When time shall serve, to show in articles,
Which long ere this we offer'd to the king,
And might by no suit gain our audience.

Westmoreland presently declares that he has come as a messenger from the general of the army, the Duke of Lancaster:

To know your griefs; to tell you from his Grace
That he will give you audience; and wherein
It shall appear that your demands are just,
You shall enjoy them.

Hastings asks if the duke has

a full commission,
In very ample virtue of his father,
To hear and absolutely to determine
Of what conditions we shall stand upon.

Westmoreland replies:

That is intended in the general's name.
I muse you make so slight a question.

The archbishop then presents Westmoreland with

this schedule,
For this contains our general grievances:
Each several article herein redress'd;
All members of our cause, both here and hence,
That are insinew'd to this action,
Acquitted by a true substantial form
And present execution of our wills
To us and to our purposes consign'd;
We come within our awful banks again
And knit our powers to the arm of peace.

Westmoreland replies:

This will I show the general. Please you, lords,
In sight of both our battles we may meet;
And either end in peace, which God so frame!
Or to the place of difference call the swords
Which must decide it.

In the next scene the archbishop, Mowbray and Hastings meet John of Lancaster, Westmoreland and other officers. The Archbishop tells Lancaster:

I sent your Grace
The parcels and particulars of our grief,

and declares that

With grant of our most just and right desires,

they will once more be obedient to the king. Westmoreland says to Lancaster:

Pleaseth your Grace, to answer them directly
How far forth you do like their articles.

Lancaster replies:

I like them all, and do allow them well;
And swear here by the honour of my blood,
My father's purposes have been mistook
My lord, these griefs shall be with speed redress'd;
Upon my soul, they shall. If this may please you,
Discharge your powers unto their several counties,
As we will ours.

The archbishop accepts the promise and sends orders to the army to disperse. When the order has been carried out, Westmoreland arrests the rebel leaders on a charge of treason. In the next scene Lancaster orders the pursuit to cease:

The heat is past; follow no further now.
Call in the powers, good cousin Westmoreland.

A few lines later Westmoreland announces:

Retreat is made and execution stay'd.

In the following scene Westmoreland reports to the king the execution of the rebel leaders.

The resemblances need not be laboured. They are plain enough. A debate of rebel leaders is interrupted by the news that the royal army is approaching. Lancaster and Monmouth are both sons of the king. The two petitions, alike in tone and identical in one of their demands, are presented to the two generals. The bearer in each case is an officer in the king's army. Later, the petitions are discussed with the generals, both armies being near at hand. Both Lancaster and Monmouth pledge themselves to have the grievances redressed; but both insist that the rebels be dispersed. Lancaster, it is true, promises that the royal army also will be dispersed. In both play and novel pursuit and slaughter follow. Both generals order the pursuit to cease. Soon after the battle the rebel leaders both in Shakespeare and Scott are executed.

Scott owes a good deal to Shakespeare here in structure and ordering, and something, too, in phrasing. But Scott does not lose his independence. The characters—Balfour, Claverhouse, Poundtext and the rest—are his own. There is nothing in *Henry IV* like the battle of Bothwell Bridge and the scene afterwards in the lonely farmhouse between Morton and the wild fanatics. When Scott really cares about what he is doing—

314 Shakespeare's 'Henry IV' and the Waverley Novels

and he does in these pages of *Old Mortality*—he is no man's servitor, not even Shakespeare's.

In *The Fair Maid of Perth* there is much to remind us of *Henry IV*, but nothing of the quality of the scenes from *Old Mortality* which have just been discussed. Archibald, Earl of Douglas,

That ever-valiant and approved Scot,

is in both the play and the novel. There are references to Hotspur's power on the Border. 'But Percy', says Rothsay to Douglas (ch. 13), 'hath seen men's backs as well as Douglas; and I have known as great wonders as that he who goes forth to seek such wool should come back shorn.' This, no doubt, is a prophecy of Douglas's defeat at Homeldon by Percy which is mentioned at the beginning of *I Henry IV*.

The ineffectual King Robert in *The Fair Maid* is not much like Henry IV, but each has a wild son. The relationship between the Duke of Rothsay and his father was portrayed with an eye on Henry and Prince Hal. 'I behold sparks of hope in him, Robin, from time to time', says King Robert to his brother (ch. 10), 'that are well worth cherishing. He is young—very young—a prince, and in the heyday of his blood.' This is from Bolingbroke's words about his son in *Richard II*:

As dissolute as desperate; yet through both
I see some sparkles of a better hope,
Which elder days may happily bring forth.¹

A little later in the novel (ch. 13), when King Robert discusses with his lords the troubled state of the country, Douglas argues that the feuds in the Highlands have their advantages. 'The ruffians will destroy each other, and the deer of the Highlands will increase as the men diminish. We shall gain as hunters the exercise we lose as warriors.' King Robert replies sadly: 'Rather say that the wolves will increase as the men diminish.' This is like the gloomy forecast of King Henry:

O my poor kingdom! sick with civil blows.
When that my care could not withhold thy riots,
What wilt thou do when riot is thy care?
O! thou wilt be a wilderness again,
Peopled with wolves, thy old inhabitants.²

¹ *R. II*, v, iii. In *The Heart of Midlothian*, ch. 33, another dissolute son, George Robertson, relating the course of his life to Jeanie Deans, says:

'Hitherto I had been
As dissolute as desperate, yet through both
Were seen some sparkles of a better hope.'

In *Woodstock*, ch. 23, the character of the future Charles II is described, and the chapter-motto is from an earlier speech of Bolingbroke's in the same scene.

² *II H. IV*, iv, v, 132-6.

Later in the chapter Douglas withdraws. Albany dismisses the Dominican prior. 'The King and I have that to say to the Prince which must have no further audience, not even yours.' A reconciliation between the king and his son follows. At the opening of the corresponding reconciliation scene in *I Henry IV* (III, ii) the king dismisses his lords:

Lords, give us leave; the Prince of Wales and I
Must have some private conference.

King Robert reproaches Rothsay for having in his service Sir John Ramorny, 'the encourager and partaker of all thy numerous vices and follies'. Soon Rothsay admits his faults and stands 'mute, conscience struck, and self-convicted'. Throwing himself at his father's feet, he promises to dismiss Ramorny. In much the same way Prince Hal confesses his errors and promises amendment. But Rothsay does not break at once with Ramorny, nor Hal with Falstaff. A later chapter, about Rothsay's revels, has for motto Falstaff's words: 'Nay, I will fit you for a young prince.'¹

No people in the plays were more frequently in Scott's mind than Falstaff and his associates. No other characters supplied him with such a commodity of good phrases. They appealed to all that was most genial and tolerant in him; they lightened his dialogue; they provided him with models. The scene of Pleydell and his High Jinks in *Guy Mannering* is a picture of old Edinburgh life, but it would not be as lively as it is if Scott had not remembered the admirable fooling at the Boar's Head in Eastcheap. Dame Ursula Suddlechop in *The Fortunes of Nigel* is surely drawn after Mistress Quickly of *The Merry Wives*. Some of Scott's bravos and bullies are after the fashion of Ancient Pistol. Captain Craigengelt in *The Bride of Lammermoor* has, like Pistol, a killing tongue and a quiet sword; and in Pistol's style he calls Bucklaw 'my lad of acres' and 'my lad of lands'. Captain Dangerfield in *Peperil of the Peak* (ch. 20) 'had a formidable pair of whiskers, a red nose, and a tarnished lace coat, together with a hat of Pistol's dimensions'. Captain Colepepper in *The Fortunes of Nigel* (ch. 12) swaggers at the ordinary and puts on his hat 'with the air of Ancient Pistol'. These worthies make the word captain as odious as Pistol made it to Doll Tearsheet. Colonel Blood in *Peperil*

¹ When King Henry is reproaching the Prince (*I H. IV*, III, ii) he refers to the behaviour of Richard II:

'The skipping king, he ambled up and down
With shallow jesters and rash bavin wits.'

This picture of an undignified king gives Scott a hint for his description (*Fortunes of Nigel*, ch. 37) of James I, who, at Nigel's marriage-feast, 'began to amble about the room, mumping, laughing, and cracking jests, neither the wittiest nor the most delicate'. See also the passage in ch. 9: 'All this while the poor king ambled up and down the apartment.'

is of the same kidney. Buckingham laughs at him for speaking in Pistol's vein. Michael Lambourne, too, in *Kenilworth* lards his talk with scraps of playhouse verse ('thou diest on point of fox') in Pistol's huffing manner. Some of Dalgetty's phrases—'base bisognos', for example—were coined in the same mint.

The characters in the novels who, consciously or unconsciously, quote *Henry IV* make a large and mixed company. Colonel Mannering, Colonel Talbot, Pleydell, Oldbuck, and others are all fond of tags from the play; and when they use them they are most like their creator. 'A fine character you'll give of Scotland upon your return, Colonel Talbot', says Edward Waverley, and receives for answer: 'O, Justice Shallow will save me the trouble—"Barren, barren, beggars all. Marry, good air"—and that only when you are fairly out of Edinburgh and not yet come to Leith, as is the case at present.' Shakespeare's words do not break the natural run of the speech. Scott's English is naturally fused with his master's. It is thus he quotes in his letters and in the *Journal*.

R. K. GORDON.

EDMONTON, CANADA.

THE POETICS OF 'L'ESPRIT DES LOIS'

OLIVER GOLDSMITH once called in question Montesquieu's greatness as a scientific thinker. 'He seems', he said in his *Enquiry into the Present State of Polite Learning in Europe*, 'more a poet than a philosopher'; and the context makes it clear that Goldsmith had far less respect for Montesquieu's ideas than for his talent in presenting them. The system of the *Esprit des Lois*, he added, does not arise *fatally* out of the facts of history, but only out of the peculiar order which the author's imagination has imposed upon them. The same facts might have been used to sustain entirely contrary arguments. It may certainly be admitted that Montesquieu's work is important, not so much for its objective marshalling of the data of history, as for the influence it has had, and may still have, upon legislation and political philosophy. Its function is not historical, but prophetic; and its method, as Goldsmith says, appears to be less philosophical than poetic.

To what extent, then, is it possible to speak of the 'poetics' of the *Esprit des Lois*? It is indubitably written in prose, and except at rare intervals the language lacks the sublimity, colour, music and rhythm we are accustomed to demand even of poetic prose. Can the content of prose be poetic? Modern criticism appears to think not, and claims that the form and content of poetry constitute an indivisible synthesis in which both disappear as such. 'There are,' says Herbert Read,¹ 'really no degrees of poetry; at least, there is no easy transition from poetry to prose. The two forms of expression are distinct in kind; we must speak in either one mode or the other.' This is probably true of the highest kind of poetry; but it is obvious that the content of much verse (like that of Pope, Boileau, Wordsworth even), which is highly distinguished in its technical execution, is not seldom prosaic; the writer's intellect may be attuned to poetry but his soul is not. On the other hand, the content of much prose (that of Chateaubriand, Rousseau, Loti, for example) may be properly described as poetic. One is even tempted to say of Montesquieu himself that there is a far more poetic outlook in his prose works than in his verse.

It is not enough, says Herbert Read again, for poetry to be *visual*; prose can be visual. Poetry must be visual in a *swift, intuitive way*. It must also, by its daring, adventure into a world of sense and sound beyond the reach of the mundane instruments of prose. That is its faculty

¹ *Form in Modern Poetry*, p. 71.

of invention, about which Keats speaks. Invention and imagery—poetry is an essence distilled by these two emotional activities. Now, although the advocate of Montesquieu as a poet would be rash to base his plea upon such a flimsy argument, it would be no hard task to show that his author is not only capable of invention and imagery—one imagines, indeed, that these were amongst the things that aroused Goldsmith's suspicion of Montesquieu as a philosopher—but that he can be visual in the swift, intuitive way here required of a poet. Dealing as he is, for the most part, with objects and facts, he is but rarely driven to the use of a concrete image to body forth an abstract idea. But his treatment of the events of history, however remote they may be in time and space, betrays a clear *vision* not merely of their external form but of their inward essence and abiding significance, albeit with a philosophical coldness and detachment concerning their morality. The following is typical:

Le Romain plus qu'un autre s'émouvait par les spectacles. Celui du corps sanglant de Lucrèce fit finir la royauté. Le débiteur qui parut sur la place publique couvert de plaies fit changer la forme de la république. La vue de Virginie fit chasser les décemvirs. Pour faire condamner Manlius, il fallut ôter au peuple la vue du capitol. La robe sanglante de César remit Rome dans la servitude. (E.L. xi, 15.)

Here at least is a poetic conception of history not unworthy of a Corneille.

When the gap of detachment is bridged, and enthusiasm or emotion enters into the argument—as it invariably does when Montesquieu speaks of the things he hates (tyranny, slavery, intolerance) or of the things he loves (freedom, feudalism)—the style is enriched with visual imagery of rare force and aptness. Thus, the peace that comes of tyranny is 'le silence de ces villes que l'ennemi est près d'occuper' (E.L. v, 14). The feudal system with its hidden sources is thus described:

C'est un beau spectacle que celui des lois féodales. Un chêne antique s'élève; l'œil en voit de loin les feuillages; il approche, il en voit la tige, mais il n'en aperçoit point les racines; il faut percer la terre pour les trouver. (E.L. xxx, 1.)

'La régie', that is to say taxation by the central government as distinct from tax-farming, is called 'l'administration d'un bon père de famille' (E.L. xiii, 19). The seraglios of the Orient are 'lieux où l'artifice, la méchanceté, la ruse, règnent dans le silence, et se couvrent d'une épaisse nuit' (E.L. v, 14). In the following brief passage on despotism, swiftness, intuition, visuality and emotion are interwoven in a swelling, rhythmic prose comparable to Isaiah and to the free verse of Whitman:

On a voulu faire régner les lois avec le despotisme;

mais ce qui est joint avec le despotisme n'a plus de force.

En vain ce despotisme, pressé par ses malheurs, a-t-il voulu s'enchaîner;
il s'arme de ses chaînes, et devient plus terrible encore.

(E.L. viii, 21.)

Such prophetic flights are, however, rare in the *Esprit des Lois*, and it cannot be supposed that Goldsmith was thinking of poetic imagery when he referred to Montesquieu as a poet. What then of rhythm? The classical French tradition was to rely at least as much upon internal rhythms of emotion or situation as upon mere metrical devices. There is in Racine, for instance, a perpetual ebb and flow, a *forte* and *piano*, a tension and relaxation, a point and counterpoint, that assure a steady-flowing rhythmical movement comparable to that of life itself. He has practically no imagery; all is movement, but it is inward movement, movement—it has been well said—within the stillness of a character. Even in Corneille, far more ‘visual’ than his great successor, there is a surprising dearth of image and symbol, but the antithetic rhythms are strongly marked. In Montesquieu, too, the rhythms are of necessity internal, rhythms of idea and arrangement rather than of syllables, words and phrases. His favourite rhythm—not entirely imposed from without by the data of history—is in three-time: three types of government (monarchy, republic, despotism); three principles (honour, virtue, fear); three kinds of education; three separate powers in the state (legislative, executive, judiciary); three balanced powers in representative government (king, Lords and Commons). Moreover, just as Racine makes the whole of a dramatic history a movement within the immobility of a character or a soul, so Montesquieu sees all history as change within the changelessness of the human spirit. For him, again, law is that which defines relations between the unmoved and unmoving essence of man and the restless social, political and physical circumstances through which evolution—the process of universal disintegration and rebirth—drags him.

Yet for all the essential inwardness of Montesquieu’s harmonies, he was too much of an artist not to seek in his literary style a music that should correspond to it. He claims in his ‘*Pensées*’ (vol. I, p. 33).

Bien des gens en France, surtout M. de la Motte, soutiennent qu’il n’y a pas d’harmonie (dans mon ouvrage). Je prouve qu’il y en a, comme Diogène prouvant à Zénon qu’il y avait du mouvement en faisant un tour de chambre.

It is regrettable that Montesquieu has left no record of his ‘proofs’, but one has only to read aloud suitable passages of the *Esprit des Lois* to discover rhythms and harmonies that charm and persuade even though the logical sense may not be grasped. As one of Montesquieu’s most able critics says, ‘Un rythme harmonieux se dégage à la lecture d’une série d’alinéas, n’ayant que quelques lignes en général et formant comme autant de couplets, dont chacun flatte l’oreille.’¹ Barckhausen suggests

¹ Barckhausen, *Montesquieu*, p. 328.

as an example the definitions at the beginning of the second book, which are as follows:

Le gouvernement républicain est celui où le peuple en corps ou seulement une partie du peuple a la souveraine puissance;

Le monarchique, celui où un seul gouverne, mais par des lois fixes et établies;

Au lieu que, dans le despotique, un seul, sans loi et sans règle, entraîne tout par sa volonté et par ses caprices.

But verbal and intellectual harmonies are native to good prose, as they are to good poetry. Their presence in the modulated phrases and systems of the *Esprit des Loix* will not suffice to establish its author as a poet. It remains to inquire whether Montesquieu's attitude of mind towards the external world was characteristic of a poet rather than of a philosopher.

In the first place, he has often been reproached for neglecting the time factor in history, and for bringing together from the extremities of the earth and of the ages historical data of apparent similarity. He appears to aim at a synthesis of human reason from the scattered evidences of its operation, without respect to the forces of evolution or change that may have conditioned them. Just as the enlightened Nature poet—a Wordsworth or a Hugo—a mystic of the material world, pierces through the diversity of the natural scene to the eternal, changeless, divine essence within it; so Montesquieu views the diversity of the historical pageant as that which reveals the unchanging, human spirit that made it. This is the true meaning of Montesquieu's 'historical method'; it is not the mere quest for precedents that it became in the hands of Blackstone and Burke.

And just as Time—the succession of events—is dissolved in the timelessness of the human spirit, so every historical event is shown to be organically related to the whole of human experience; it blends into the total life of humanity and derives significance from its relation to the whole. Montesquieu's field of vision is a world of law, by which he states that he means a world of relationships. He is not interested in the raw materials of history—men, things, events—but only in the organic attractions and repulsions that relate them each to each. Thus he goes behind the diversity of the phenomenal world to the unity of a noumenal world of ideas, principles and laws, in a word, of 'spirit'. Herein Montesquieu's jurisprudence appears to have very real affinities with both poetry and prophecy.

In the very first book of the *Esprit des Loix*, Montesquieu sets forth the principle of the integral relatedness of all things in the universe, from God (thinly disguised as 'la Raison primitive') down to the earth-soil.

That principle, or still better that intuition, is essentially poetic and will be found underlying the lyrical poetry of the great French Romantics. Montesquieu's vision of the whole of reality as a living organism, though less transcendent, is not different in kind from Hugo's pantheism or from Dante's great final vision in the heavenly Paradise.

Nel suo profondo vidi che s'interna
 legato con amore in un volume
 ciò che per l'universo si squaderna;
 Sostanzia ed accidenti, e lor costume,
 quasi conflati insieme per tal modo,
 che ciò ch'io dico è un semplice lume.
 La forma universal di questo nodo
 credo ch'io vidi, perchè più di largo
 dicendo questo, mi sento ch'io godo.

(Within its depths I saw ingathered, bound by love in one mass, the scattered leaves of the universe; *substances and accidents and their relations*, as though together fused, so that what I speak of is one simple flame. The universal form of this complex I think I saw, because, as I say this, more largely do I feel myself rejoice.)

Montesquieu, of course, does not think of 'Love' as the universal solvent in which all contradictions are resolved and all diversity unified. Belonging as he did to a rationalistic age, he named the 'primum mobile' not, like Dante, 'il primo Amore', but 'la Raison primitive'. If then for 'Love' in the above passage we read 'Reason', there is scarcely a phrase that cannot be paralleled in Montesquieu's introductory pages to the *Esprit des Loïs*. Moreover, Mr T. S. Eliot suggests in his book on Dante (pp. 67-8) that the word 'Amore' in the *Paradiso* denotes something far wider and more universal than its dictionary translation. Nor is there any ground for believing that Montesquieu's 'Raison primitive' has any relation with human cogitations; it is rather the uncaused cause that has created the universe.

Mr T. S. Eliot explains Dante's occasional much-criticized excursions into pagan myth and personal fancy in a passage which applies with remarkable aptness to Montesquieu's *penchant* for the extravagant, the inauthentic, and the curious. 'He has been reproved or smiled at for satisfying personal grudges by putting in Hell men whom he knew and hated; but these, as well as Ulysses, are transformed in the whole; for the real and the unreal are all representative of types of sin, suffering, fault and merit, and *all become of the same reality and contemporary*.' So too in Montesquieu, real and unreal, Siam, Bantam and Japan, the fairy tales of irresponsible travellers, are all representative of types of justice, injustice, tyranny, stupidity, suffering, fault and merit, and all become of the same reality, contemporary and adjacent.

Montesquieu's principle concerning the relativity of law to physical

environment was the germ which led to the rebirth of the lyrical spirit in France. It has already been pointed out that he conceived of laws as the relationships that exist or that come into being between men and men, between men and things, and between mankind and external nature. In so far as those laws apply to social behaviour they are jurisprudence, but in so far as they apply to intellectual or artistic behaviour they are canons of criticism. It was of the latter that Mme de Stael wrote in her epoch-making work *De la Littérature*, which inaugurated the process of weaning art from the metaphysical canon which French neo-classicism had imposed in the name of ancient Greece. Montesquieu affirms, in effect, that when a 'law'—and this will include a literary 'law'—that has necessarily come into being as the result of local circumstances, tries to emigrate beyond its own natural frontiers and impose itself upon the world at large, it is committing an act of pure aggression, is trying to force nature into false moulds, and is violating the universal right of men and nations to free growth and self-expression. He says (*E.L.* I, 3):

(Les lois) doivent être tellement propres au peuple pour lequel elles sont faites, que c'est un très grand hasard si celles d'une nation peuvent convenir à une autre.

And he proceeds to enumerate the different circumstances, physical, moral and spiritual, to which all laws which affect human beings must necessarily be related. Mme de Staël studies, in precisely the same sense, and in similar language to Montesquieu's, the mutual dependencies of institutions, manners and literature, and hence works up to the dogma that each nation and each epoch almost necessarily differs from every other, and that each has the right to be itself. It follows, as a particular case, that France, being Christian and northern, and endowed with the peculiar qualities communicated by her religion, her climate and other physical forces, must of necessity differ from Greece, which was pagan and southern; and hence, any effort on the part of France to imitate Greece is to prostitute her own personality and to kill the natural flower of her genius. This is clearly but a particular case arising from the general principle of relativity; and it must be regarded as more or less accidental that the most distinguished application of that principle should be labelled Romanticism and be associated with particular states of mind and types of literature. Victor Hugo's doctrine, as set forth in the Preface to *Cromwell*, deliberately shifting the artist's gaze from the beauty and nobility cultivated by the Greeks to the grotesque and the ignoble, has given a very special interpretation to that 'liberty' which Mme de Staël's more universal principle had claimed for French art and literature.

Hugo's work appears, then, in some respects, as a mere branch or bud on the main stem of intellectual progress in France; and though he may be a far greater genius and artist than Mme de Stael, he must be accounted of less significance in determining the broad lines of French literary evolution. That main stem is represented by such men as Balzac, Comte and Taine, whose brilliant analyses of local conditions and their hold over men bring an ever-increasing vitality to French art. It may be objected that all this does not prove that the *Esprit des Lois* is poetry; but it may be pointed out that our subject is not so much the poetry of the work as its poetics, wherein is included—amongst other things—its value as poetic doctrine.

If we try to view the *Esprit des Lois* as a whole—and this is precisely what Montesquieu asks us to do—we shall not fail to perceive beneath the apparent disorder a genuine coherency and unity. The multifarious material groups itself in orderly fashion round a few brilliant intuitions. True, there is a considerable mass of marginal material which gives an appearance of raggedness to the lines. But thanks to Montesquieu's remarkable capacity for seizing the relationships between things, their hidden identities and occult differences, he has on the whole little difficulty in assigning them to their appropriate place in the scheme and so in revealing their true significance. Like the poet and the mystic, he is adept at resolving apparent contradictions; never is he more profound, more poetic, than when he extracts the essential truth or 'spirit' that unites contradictory groups of facts. He not only shows how 'les lois qui paraissent contraires dérivent quelquefois du même esprit' (*E.L.* xxix, 10), and how 'les lois qui paraissent les mêmes sont quelquefois réellement différentes' (*E.L.* xxix, 12); but also instructs us in the process whereby 'deux lois diverses peuvent être comparées' (*E.L.* xxix, 11). Perhaps the most brilliant—certainly the most spectacular—intuition in the whole book is Montesquieu's identification of political liberty with parliamentary institutions and the separation of powers (*E.L.* xi, 6). Other thinkers had written of these things as separate conceptions; it was Montesquieu who first perceived the spirit of each and declared them to be one and the same. But the book is full of such swift intuitions; indeed, they make it. His discovery of the principles of government—virtue in republics, honour in monarchies, moderation in autocracies, fear in despotic states—was a pure and very daring intuition controlled, as all sound intuitions are controlled, by long preparation of knowledge and meditation. It was just these intuitions that enabled Montesquieu to bring into vast yet simple order enormous masses

of facts that had hitherto remained unrelated and chaotic, and so to light the way to future legislators. Like the poet, Montesquieu lived in a more highly integrated world than the ordinary man or the ordinary scholar, a world the principle of which is quality or spirit. That does not prevent it from being an infinitely diverse world—a flowing stream wherein, during the onward sweep and frequent eddies of history, each molecule may make contact with any other, without ever losing its own individuality and significance.

Although Montesquieu perceives society as having been disposed into certain patterns by the operation of such moral principles as honour, virtue and moderation, his own attitude towards it is the aesthetic one of the poet, not the ethical one of the philosopher. He thinks of actions not merely as good, but as beautiful and strong. 'Une belle action', he says, 'est celle qui a de la bonté et qui demande de la force pour la faire.' Virtue is much, but it is not all. The poet, too, does not *reject* the moral (as a rule); he only demands something more inclusive, something from which, indeed, the conventionally moral may be absent. In a similar way, Montesquieu is able to see through apparent evil to the essential good behind it—and this because his perspective is wider, both temporally and spatially, such that he perceives things in their eternal aspect. Speaking of Louis XIV's misfortunes in war, he says:

Le ciel, qui connaît les vrais avantages, l'a mieux servi par des défaites qu'il n'aurait fait par des victoires. Au lieu de le rendre le seul roi de l'Europe, il le favorisa plus en le rendant le plus puissant de tous. (E.L. IX, 7.)

Again, considering his pet aversion, despotism, he says, 'le mal qui le limite est un bien'—a curious phrase clearly suggesting an ultimate and absolute good lying beyond the relative good and evil of human morality. Rarely, if ever, does Montesquieu pass moral judgments upon things. Nor does he display any desire to force the world into a particular mould determined by his own prejudices. Like D. H. Lawrence's poet, he is in a sense amorphous, without definite personality or form, infinitely suggestible like an unformed, but intelligent, child. That wonder, which Aristotle tells us is the beginning of all philosophy, never leaves him. 'Tout m'intéresse, tout m'étonne,' he writes in the person of Usbek in the *Lettres Persanes*. 'Je suis comme un enfant dont les organes, encore tendres, sont vivement frappés par les moindres objets.' The infinite variety of objects of which he speaks in the *Lettres Persanes* with such freshness, gaiety and malice, are the best proof of his wide-eyed receptivity, but it is because, like a child, he interposes between his mind and the external world *no* preconceived notions, *no* moral prejudices,

that his vision remains undimmed. He has no *préventions* to warp his judgement or blind his vision; he sees things ever with a direct eye. 'Je vois', he once said, 'je vois la lumière avec une espèce de ravissement', and we are told that his eye was 'largement ouvert et, bien qu'affaibli de bonne heure et prématurément voilé, plein de feu, plein de génie, avide de clarté'.

The final term of vision, poetic, philosophical or religious, is God; and it cannot be doubted that Montesquieu—perhaps in spite of himself, certainly in spite of his environment—attained to some religious feeling for the divinity at work in the world. 'La contemplation même de l'ordre des faits et des idées le détournait du scepticisme', says Sorel;¹ 'l'étude approfondie des institutions sociales l'amena au respect des croyances religieuses.' Such a phrase as the one already quoted ('Le ciel, qui connaît les vrais avantages') indicates a real *feeling* for an All-wise, All-powerful, and even All-loving God. There is little in common between such a God and Voltaire's 'intellectual residue of the universe'. True, Montesquieu never brought himself to observe religious practices, and assuredly he was not without some justification for despising the official catholicism of his time. But within his own soul the true light shone, greater in degree and not fundamentally different in kind from that 'dim religious light' which filters through the churches into the hearts of the faithful.

All things considered, Goldsmith's judgement on Montesquieu appears to be based on an unreal distinction. Like many another genius—Rousseau and Hugo, for example—he was both poet and philosopher. He was poet in the universal freedom and scope of his vision, by his suggestibility in the presence of the data of experience, by his faculty for seeing things steadily and seeing them whole, by his intuitions, by his 'daring adventures into the world of sense', by his technical skill in composition; he must be regarded as a philosopher because of his subject-matter and of his chosen mode of expression. If he had attempted to write political poetry, like Voltaire or Thomas Gray, he would probably have succeeded at least as well, and probably better than they, for his general treatment of institutions is much more inspired and profound. It may be recalled that Gray, having planned and begun a long poem on the relations between Education and the State, abandoned his attempt on reading the *Esprit des Lois*, because Montesquieu had treated the subject so much better than he could hope to do. Be that as it may, there can be no reasonable doubt that Montesquieu had much of the poetic outlook on

¹ Sorel, *Montesquieu*, pp. 13-14.

reality and not a little of the poetic technique. Through the steady contemplation of a particular wide order of reality he came at length to apprehend the eternal spirit within it; at that point his vision became poetic *and* prophetic. If Goldsmith had described him as 'more a *seer* than a philosopher' he would probably have been nearer the truth.

F. T. H. FLETCHER.

LIVERPOOL.

D. FRANCISCO MANUEL DE MELO

My book *D. Francisco Manuel de Melo, esboço biographico*, appeared in 1914 and, since then, further facts bearing on his life have been ascertained and recorded by Teófilo Braga and other investigators, more editions of his writings have been published and some earlier editions, previously unknown, have come to light. I propose to set down this new information here, since at present it is impossible to issue a second and corrected edition of my work, and I shall do so by reference to the pages of the first edition, and take the opportunity to correct some of its errors.

Menéndez y Pelayo considered D. Francisco Manuel de Melo to be a 'great man' and planned to write his life, a design which, to our loss, he did not carry out (vide a collection of his *cartas* in *Boletim da Academia das Ciencias de Lisboa*, XII, 1174, 1180, 1186 [p. xix]).

In the title of Buckle's book *England* should be *Europe* (p. 23).

The result of the Battle of the Downs was summarized, just after the event, by Lord Baltimore, in a letter of 17 November 1639, preserved in the records at Somerset House, London, and printed in the *Times Literary Supplement* of 15 May 1930, as follows:

The Spanish fleete is not so totallie lost as is generally reported. The Admiral of Spaine with 10 more arrived safely at Dunkirke: some 24 runne upon ground neer to Dover. The Admirall of Portugall was fired and blowne upp and 900 men with him, after he fought bravelie and sank divers of the Hollanders, whoe lost 25 ships. 4 Spanish shippes escaped and got into Plymouth. The rest of the Spanish fleete were either taken, sunke, burnt or dispersed, soe as there is yet no news of the safety of anie more of them. There are great complaints made by the Spaniards against Captain Pennington, whoe the Spaniards say did betray them, howsoever they say hee did very manfully runne awaye, whether by order or noe is not yet knowne, the generall reporte is that hee shall be questioned. Something must bee done to satisfie the Spaniards, an extraordinarie messenger is despatched 4 days since. This terrible seafight was on Friday last was (*sic*) seavenight. (p. 126.)

It was De Ruyter and not Tromp who burnt English ships in the Medway, the year being 1667 (p. 127). For 'Blake' read 'Monk' (p. 128).

T. Braga (*Os seiscentistas*, p. 153) suggests two alternative and reasonable explanations, neither of them discreditable to D. Francisco Manuel, for his conduct after his release from imprisonment in Madrid early in 1641; one that he sought to avoid a more severe penalty and leave Spain, the other that he desired to safeguard his future in the event of the possible loss of Portuguese independence, which had only recently been achieved and was still unstable (p. 153).

In four places I unconsciously did D. Francisco Manuel an injustice by using the expressions *versatil* and *versatilidade* when I intended to say that he had many and varied talents. The same word has a different meaning in Portuguese and English (pp. 156, 183, 410, 585).

The Treaty of 12 June 1641 between Portugal and the United Provinces was, of course, merely a truce and not a permanent peace (p. 157).

The fleet commanded by D. Francisco Manuel, which left Holland for Portugal in August 1641, was forced by bad weather to take refuge at Falmouth, and it was there, and not elsewhere, that the meeting between him and Admiral Tromp took place. The following account of it, from this Admiral's *Journal*, has been translated from the Dutch original MS. at the Hague by my friend Major C. R. Boxer:

'17th September 1641. [Tromp put into Falmouth to careen his flagship.] I found lying in Vaelmut, in the ship of Hendrik Geurssen of Amsterdam, Don Francisco Manuel de Mello, Admiral of the Portuguese Armada which left our country at the end of last [month] with eleven ships of war and 22 hired ships. He had reached 48° about 40 miles out at sea, and there the Ambassador¹ in person had transferred himself from the ship Tetis, it being leaky, into the frigate of Symon Tijssen; and it began to blow a very hard westerly wind, so that the Ambassador with some ships got separated from the others, wherefore he, the Admiral, came hither in order to find the aforesaid Ambassador; he had with him the ships as per margin,² similarly those in Plymouth. He struck his flag for us and we again for him, and saluted each other with cannon shot, it being handsome weather.... The 18th ditto... whilst I went in person to visit the admiral of Portugal, who paid me great honours.... The 21st September... there came aboard us the interpreter of the Admiral Don Francisco with the Hofmeester of his Majesty of Portugal, who declared to me that he could obtain no credit here wherewith to buy the necessary supplies, without which he could not leave with this present favourable wind; he besought my assistance to act as surety for him with the English, to which end he presented me with a gold chain of about $\frac{1}{2}$ a pound weight and a hat-band decked with pearls. I answered that I myself would advance 800 guilders to His Majesty of Portugal; and I gave him 800 guilders in cash down forthwith, whilst they handed to me two Letters of Exchange drawn on Salvador Rodrigues, a Portuguese at Amsterdam, and I kept the gold chain and the hat-band.... The 23rd ditto: in the morning a faint breeze with handsome weather. The Admiral of Portugal set sail with the ships as per margin.³

Rijksarchief: Admiraliteits Colleges, XLVII, 1, fol. 151.

Major Boxer has also supplied an account of the doings of the Dutch fleet sent to the aid of Portugal in 1641, from Dutch biographies of de Ruyter and French and Spanish sources, as follows:

It was composed of twenty ships, with 2500 sailors, under Admiral Amout Gysels (who had served in the East Indies and acted as Governor of Amboina from 1631 to 1633), Vice-Admiral Jacob Pietersen Tolck

¹ Tristão de Mendonça Furtado.

² Find in Vaelmut the Admiral of Portugal in the ship of Hendrik Geurssen of Amsterdam. The young Cop of Amsterdam. Lervaes van Colster. The bark Longa. A horse transport-ship. 2 hired ships. There was also in Plymouth the ship Tetis, the frigate and a horse-transport.

³ Those mentioned in the preceding note. The ships in Plymouth joined the Admiral on the 21st.

and Rear-Admiral Michiel Adriaanz de Ruyter. The fleet left Holland on 12 August 1641, and reached Lisbon in September, after the Franco-Portuguese squadron had left for Cadiz. Gysels left Lisbon on 18 September, but missed the Allied fleet which had fought the Spanish fleet on 11 September, and he cruised between Cape St Vincent, Ayamonte and Cadiz during October, on the watch for the ships from Havana. On 4 November he met the Spanish fleet under the Duke of Ciudad Real, consisting of nine galleons, ten Dunkirk vessels, four frigates and a caravel; twenty-four sail in all. The Dutch lost two ships; and their Vice-Admiral, with most of the remainder, fought very little, the brunt of the action being borne by Gysels, Ruyter and the two vessels that were sunk, yet they claimed a victory and alleged that the Spaniards had lost 1100 men in killed and wounded, besides two ships that afterwards sank. This, however, is unlikely, and it was really a Spanish victory because the Dutch were compelled to put back to Lisbon, which they reached on 6 November. The French fleet had already left for home, and the Portuguese showed no disposition to come out. The Dutch captains were each given a gold medal. On the 20th news came that the Spanish fleet, now twenty-seven ships strong, was again at sea, but Gysels could not get the Portuguese to sea and would not attack the Spaniards without them. Tired of waiting, he hoisted the signal for departure on 4 January 1642, but was held up by a storm until the 7th, when ten Portuguese vessels were ready to put to sea with the Dutch. But desertion was rife in the Dutch ships, supplies were short, and at a Council held on the 6th it was decided to return to Holland; this was carried out on the 11th. The ill success of the voyage is ascribed to the bad quality of the crews, both officers and men, the lack of soldiers on board, the poor construction of the vessels, and the inaction of the Portuguese. Gysels's fleet reached Lisbon, on the outward voyage from Holland, on 11 September 1641, but D. Francisco Manuel with his vessels only got into the Tagus on 16 October (pp. 160, 161).

François Lanier served as French Resident in Lisbon for two periods between 1640 and 1650. He was intimate with John IV, and his numerous official reports and letters are of great value on account of their detailed information about the public affairs of Portugal at that time, and they deserve to be printed. They will be found in the *Correspondance du Portugal* at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Paris (p. 210, n. 1).

At p. 231, the first footnote should be deleted.

The account of the stay of Prince Rupert and Prince Maurice with their ships in the Tagus probably needs to be modified by reference to

an article by R. C. Atkinson in *Mariner's Mirror*, vol. xvii; also to J. Corbett's *England in the Mediterranean*, I, 206, and Hodgkin MSS. x, ii, p. 120, *Hist. MSS. Com.* (p. 242).

There is no doubt that the Quinta belonging to D. Francisco at Alcantara was the Quinta do Cabrinha. From the *Rois de desobriga* of the parish of the Ajuda dating from 1692, discovered and studied by Snr Mário de Sampayo Ribeiro, it appears (as he kindly informed me) that until the first quarter of the eighteenth century the Quinta was still known by the name of D. Francisco Manuel (p. 265). A photograph of 1938 in my possession shows a large irregular mansion of the seventeenth century (?) with many acres of cultivated land.

Among the papers of Dr Arruda there are, or were, nine letters from D. Francisco Manuel, in one of which, dated 25 February 1656 from Bahia, he declares that his health is 'cada vez mais fallida' (p. 281).

Some alterations are needed at p. 285 in view of articles by D. Carolina Michaelis in *Boletim Bibliographico da Universidade de Coimbra*, II, 1 and 2.

The letter at p. 286 was addressed to Brito Freire and was reproduced from an inaccurate copy. Four or five words need alteration, but the substance is not important.

Illness and the advice of friends induced D. Francisco Manuel to leave Brazil without permission and take the consequences. The political situation in Portugal had changed. John IV was dead, and his widow, the Queen-Regent, did not wield the same authority. Perhaps some of his enemies had lost their influence, while others may have been placated. In any case he had friends in high places who worked for him and, so far as we know, he was not molested when he returned to Portugal; thanks to them and to his own efforts, he effected a settlement with the plaintiffs in his process and discharged the fines he had been condemned to pay (p. 291).

Regarding D. Jorge Manuel and his father's reasons for appointing a mere servant as executor of his will and guardian of the boy, Teófilo Braga (*Os seiscentistas*, pp. 341, 354) makes various suggestions (but vide J. J. de Vilhena, *As dividas de D. Francisco Manuel de Melo*, hereafter mentioned) (pp. 296, 401).

The letter of pardon to D. Francisco Manuel, dated 30 July 1662, was found and printed by Teófilo Braga in *Os seiscentistas*, from Chancelaria da Ordem de Cristo, vol. XLVII, fol. 261 (p. 329).

The late J. Lúcio de Azevedo, author (inter alia) of that most valuable book *Os Christãos novos em Portugal*, once told me that he doubted whether D. Francisco Manuel had instructions to treat of the affair of

the converted Jews in Rome because the Conde de Castelmelhor was opposed to their claims and would not ask for a general pardon. He suggested that the Jews misunderstood the object of the mission, or that D. Francisco Manuel may have misled them to obtain their help in his real work. However, the late Lucien Wolf, President of the Jewish Historical Society of England, seems to have possessed evidence to the contrary, and in a letter of 14 November 1927, he wrote to me as follows:

He [D. Francisco Manuel] was on terms of close friendship with leading Marranos like Fernando Mendes da Costa, Duarte da Silva and Gomes Rodrigues, and he took a large part in the efforts made by those three Jews and certain enlightened politicians in Portugal in 1661-5 to secure the removal of Jewish disabilities in that country (p. 348).

D. Francisco Manuel appears to have returned to Portugal in January 1666, and he died suddenly, according to a servant of his—'foi Deos servido levalo pera si apresadamente'—on 24 August following, in the parish of Nossa Senhora da Pena in Lisbon. The death certificate was printed at p. 154 of vol. x of the *Revista de História*. In view of what we know of his character, it is strange that his servants should have been obliged to sue his executor and son for wages in arrear: one of them claimed he had not been paid for nine years. D. Francisco Manuel was a large property-owner, and during his diplomatic missions he appears to have received from the Government an allowance of 250 milreis a month, a considerable sum in those days (vide J. J. de Vilhena, op. cit., in *Instituto de Coimbra*, vol. LXXXIV, no. 2) (p. 391).

The second line of the French verses should be 'Bien fol est qui s'y fie' (p. 408). For 'Walmer' read 'Falmouth' (p. 477 n.).

There is a fine copper-plate engraved portrait of D. Francisco de Melo in a medical work in Latin, *Stadium Apollinare*, by Fernão Mendez, physician to Queen Catherine of Braganza (Louvain, 1668); the British Museum has a copy. The portrait of D. Francisco de Melo in the 1826 edition of the *Historia de los movimientos, separación y guerra de Cataluña* is evidently derived from the above engraving and included by mistake; the editor confused the cousins, owing to the similarity of their names (p. 573).

Some non-Portuguese writers, e.g. the Spanish scholar Jacinto Octavio Picón, refer to D. Francisco Manuel as 'Melo', but this is an error. He preferred the nobler surname of Manuel, probably because this family claimed descent from St Ferdinand III, King of Castile, and he used it on the title-pages of his printed works; he was so called by others in his lifetime as my biography shows, but usually signed himself in brief 'D. Fran^{co} Me!'. It may be that Picón thought Manuel to be a Christian

name; I fell into this mistake in a pamphlet published in 1905 and was corrected by my friend the genealogist Anselmo Braamcamp Freire. Picón gave a notice of my book in the *Boletín de la Real Academia Española*, I (1914), 619-23, which I read for the first time in 1940.

We may fairly suppose that when D. Francisco Manuel put his pen on various occasions at the service of John IV during his lengthy imprisonment near and in Lisbon, he did so in the hope of obtaining a pardon. He was working on his life of the King, *Tacito Portugues*, in 1650; but when his appeals against his sentence and his Memorials to the Monarch proved fruitless, he appears to have ceased work on the royal biography, which remains the fragment we now possess. After the King's death he had no motive to pursue the subject, and after his return from exile and for the last six years of his life, when not abroad on foreign missions, he was busy re-editing his more important writings. It is worthy of note that many of these had been published during his imprisonment, which cannot, therefore, have been very rigorous. During his stay of nearly a year in Rome, in 1664, he saw through the press a new edition of his studies of St Augustine and St Francis of Assisi, together with a hitherto unprinted work, *Vitoria del Hombre* in the *Obras morales* (dedicated to Queen Catherine of Braganza), and, in the following year, his *Obras metricas*, with a quantity of fresh matter, appeared at Lyons, where he made a long stay. It is remarkable that this book of more than 350 pages, written in Portuguese and Spanish and printed in France, should be so free from errors. The credit for this—although the author's handwriting was, in the specimens that have reached us, quite legible—may be ascribed in part to two distinguished Jesuits, both poets, who, though they were Frenchmen, were able to improve his Castilian verses, and probably joined him in revising the proofs. The paper used in the book is very thin, but in my copy and in others I have seen it is still in perfect condition (p. 593).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following additions should be made to the list in my book:

Editions

- (1) *Historia de los movimientos, separación y guerra de Cataluña*, 3 vols., Madrid, 1904-17 (Biblioteca Universal, vols. 46, 47, 49).
- (2) *Idem.*, pp. xxxix + 393, Madrid, 1914 (Biblioteca Clásica, vol. LXV).
- (3) *Idem.*, 2 vols., Madrid, 1928 (Bibliotecas populares Cervantes, serie ia; Las Cien mejores Obras de la Literatura Española, vols. LI, LII).
- (4) *Relaçam dos successos da Armada*, etc., in *Annais da Bibliotheca Nacional do Rio de Janeiro*, xx (1898), 158-65.
- (5) *Carta de Guia de Casados*, Lisboa, 1826, 8vo, pp. iv + 170 + ii.

- (6) Idem., *com um estudo critico, notas e glossario por Edgar Prestage*, Porto, 1916, 8vo, pp. 225.
 (7) Idem., 2nd edition of the preceding. Porto, 1923, 8vo, pp. 205.
 (8) *Epanaforas de varia historia portuguesa*, 3rd ed., revista e anotada por E. Prestage. Coimbra, 1931, 8vo, pp. xxi+463.
 (9) *Demonstracion porque el Reyno de Portugal, etc.*, Lisboa, Antonio Craesbeeck de Mello, 1664, 4to, fols. 17.
 (10) *Apologos dialogaes, anotados e precedidos de um esboço bio-bibliographico por Fernando Nery*. Rio de Janeiro, 1920, pp. xxvii+16+464+cxii+19+2.
 (11) *Feira dos Aneizins*, Lisboa, 1916, 4to, pp. 255.
 (12) *Tacito portuguez. Vida, morte, ditos e feitos de El-Rei D. João IV, segundo apografo inedito da Biblioteca Nacional; com introdução, informação e notas de Aframo Peixoto, Rodolfo Garcia e Pedro Calmon*. Rio de Janeiro, 1940, 8vo, pp. xxx+293, with facsimiles.

The text of the Rio copy (as of the copies in Portugal) is corrupt and the meaning often very dubious. The style, like that of the *Obras morales*, has the defects (as they are now considered) that characterize most of the Peninsular prose writers of the seventeenth century, though these are rarely to be found in the *Epanaforas* and were purposely avoided in the *Carta de Guia de Casados*. It is surprising that all these works should be by the same hand, and it gives another proof of the versatility of D. Francisco Manuel.

Selections

- (13) *Versos meditos de D. Francisco Manuel de Melo in Revista de Historia*, xiv, 258-65.
 (14) *O poeta Melodino. D. Francisco Manuel de Melo: Rimas portuguesas, sonetos, eclogas, cantares, poesias varias. Farsa do Fidalgo Aprendiz e Oração academica, rev. e anot. por José Pereira Javares*. Porto, 1921, 8vo, pp. 304.
 (15) *D. Manuel de Menezes—da Epanafora tragica, prefacio e notas de Antonio Sergio*. Lisboa, 1936, 8vo, pp. 35.
 (16) *Cartas familiares, ordenadas por M. Rodrigues Lapa* (Coleção dos Classicos Sá da Costa). Lisboa, 1937, 8vo, pp. xxviii+289.
 (17) *Relogios Falantes, prefacio e notas de Antonio Sergio*. Lisboa, 1936, 8vo, pp. 61.
 (18) Idem., Lisboa, 1938, 2nd ed. of no. 17, pp. 61.
 (19) Idem., Lisboa, 1940, 3rd ed. of no. 17, pp. 72.
 (20) Idem., *prefacio e notas de Rodrigues Lapa*. Lisboa, 1939, 8vo, pp. 68.
 (21) Idem., Lisboa, 1940, 2nd ed. of no. 20.
 (22) Idem., *prefacio e notas de Joaquim Ferreira*, Porto, 1942, pp. 105.
 (23) *D. Francisco Manuel de Melo: Trechos escolhidos por Mario Gonçalves Viana*. Porto, 1940, pp. 300.

Translations

- (24) *Il primo scuoprimento dell' Isola de Madera fatto da Roberto Macico inglese... tradotta dal Portoghese nell' Italiano e molto accresciuta dal P. Teodoro da Pavia, etc.*, Tortona, 1705, 8vo, pp. viii+190-2 (a translation of the third of the *Epanaforas*).

Studies

- (25) *D. Francisco Manuel de Mello*, by E. Prestage, 1922, 8vo (Hispanic Notes and Monographs: Portuguese series, no. 3).
 (26) Idem., Coimbra 1933 (Portuguese version of the preceding).
 (27) *El historiador Melo*, by J. N. Roca in *La España Regional*, i (1886), 596-93.
 (28) *D. Francisco Manuel e a Inquisição*, by Pedro de Azevedo, in *Archivo Historico Portugues*, vol. iii.
 (29) *A visita das Fontes de D. Francisco Manuel de Melo*, by Mario Brandão. Coimbra, 1925.
 (30) *O conceito da poesia no seculo XVII: D. Francisco Manoel de Mello*, by Hernani Cidade in *Boletim de Filologia*, i (1933), fasc. 3-4.

(31) *D. Francisco Manuel de Melo e o descobrimento da Madeira*, by Antonio Gonçalves Rodrigues. Lisboa, 1935, pp. 82.

(32) *As dividas de D. Francisco Manuel de Melo*, by João Jardim de Vilhena, in *Instituto de Coimbra*, vol. LXXXIV, no. 2.

(33) *Uma comédia inédita de D. Francisco Manuel de Melo: De burlas haze amor veras*, by Antonio Correia de Almeida e Olveira, in *Ocidente*, IV (1939), no. 10.

I have seen only half the works described above and am obliged to give the rest on the authority of others. Colonel Costa Veiga, Director of the Lisbon National Library, and Dr Henry Thomas, of the British Museum, have kindly sent me particulars of many of them.

Unpublished Works

In the *Catalogo dos Manuscritos da Casa Cadaval*, by Martinho da Fonseca, the following MS. is registered at p. 28:

Historia propria y universal del Reyno de Portugal y sus conquistas en Europa, Africa, Asia y América, por D. Francisco Manuel, 1648, fol.

EDGAR PRESTAGE.

LYME REGIS.

GEORG CHRISTOPH LICHTENBERG: ON THE
OCCASION OF THE TWO HUNDREDTH
ANNIVERSARY OF HIS BIRTH,
9 JULY 1942

Lichtenbergs Schriften können wir uns als der wunderbarsten Wunschrute bedienen: wo er einen Spass macht, liegt ein Problem verborgen.¹

Ich möchte lieber mit Lichtenberg vergessen werden als unsterblich seyn mit Jean Paul.²

Wenn man von Goethes Schriften absieht, und namentlich von Goethes Unterhaltungen mit Eckermann, dem besten deutschen Buch, das es gibt: was bleibt eigentlich übrig von der deutschen Prosaliteratur, das es verdiente, wieder und wieder gelesen zu werden? Lichtenbergs Aphorismen, das erste Buch von Jung-Stillings Lebensgeschichte, Adalbert Stifters Nachsommer und Gottfried Kellers Leute von Seldwyla—und damit wird es einstweilen am Ende sein.³

THE first of these three quotations comes from Goethe, the second from Hebbel, the third from Nietzsche, and they prove the measure of deep admiration that Lichtenberg has been receiving from the greatest Germans for more than a century and a half. We should add a fourth quotation, taken from a letter of recommendation, dated 5 October 1774, written by W. Gordon in Göttingen and addressed to Sir Robert Keith, the British ambassador in Vienna, which goes to show that amongst his contemporaries Lichtenberg also had a reputation outside the realm of literature:

All the English who come here are recommended to him, and he is what one may call their father and protector.⁴

The man who in these words is described as a great prose writer, a wise humorist, and a friend and mentor of Englishmen visiting Göttingen, was a professor of physics, mathematics, and astronomy in the university of the electorate of Hanover. In the history of science he is remembered for the discovery of the so-called 'Lichtenbergsche Figuren', and as a selenograph who has given his name to a small crater on the moon.⁵ He has written a number of scientific treatises about his special subjects, which were published in 1800 by his brother Ludwig Christian Lichtenberg and Friedrich Kries in the first now very rare edition of his collected works. Besides, in order to augment his small salary, from 1778 to 1799

¹ *Maximen und Reflexionen. Schriften der Goethegesellschaft*, xxi, ed. Max Hecker, 1907, p. 158.

² *Tagebücher*, ed. R. M. Werner (*Werke*, krit. Ausg., 2. Abt., vol. 3), No. 3805.

³ *Menschliches, Allzumenschliches*, Leipzig, 1897, p. 257.

⁴ This letter was published by H. Hecht, *Briefe aus Lichtenbergs englischem Freundeskreis*, Göttingen, 1925.

⁵ Paul Hahn, *Lichtenberg und die exakten Naturwissenschaften*, Göttingen, 1927.

he edited the *Göttinger Taschenkalender*, being himself almost sole contributor, and from 1780 the *Göttingisches Magazin der Wissenschaften und Literatur*. He also wrote for other periodicals such as the *Deutsches Museum*, which was edited by Boie. However, the part of his work by which he is mainly known to-day is the *Bemerkungen*, Lichtenberg's entries in his diaries. The second edition of his works, which had been compiled and published by his sons Georg Christian and Christian Wilhelm in 1844, contained a selection from those note-books which Lichtenberg himself called his 'Sudelbücher'; but only in 1896, after prolonged research, the diaries themselves were rediscovered by Albert Leitzmann who subsequently published them. The year of publication marks the beginning of Lichtenberg's true fame; only since Leitzmann's publication of the diaries do we know who Lichtenberg was, what he really thought, and the position he occupies in German literature.

Lichtenberg's life was on the whole uneventful. He was the eighteenth and youngest child of a country parson in Oberramstadt, near Darmstadt. In Darmstadt he went to the Lateinschule and Gymnasium; later on he was granted a scholarship by the Landgraf of Hessen, and became a student in the university of Göttingen. The brilliant professor of mathematics in that university, Gotthelf Abraham Kästner, took an interest in him and recommended him to the curator, Baron von Münchhausen; he helped him to pay his way by securing him certain commissions, such as the writing of poems on festive occasions, the contribution of essays to periodicals, and the post of a companion and mentor to Englishmen who had come to study at their continental university. In 1770 Lichtenberg travelled to London for the first time; on his return he heard of his appointment as 'extraordinary' professor of mathematics in the university of Göttingen. He accepted this position without informing his sovereign, the Landgraf of Hessen (whose intention it had been to appoint him a schoolmaster in Giessen), that he had become a British professor in Göttingen. Shortly afterwards Lichtenberg interrupted his work at the university in order to complete a land survey in some towns of the electorate for King George III. From August 1774 to December 1775 he again stayed in London. On his journey home the news reached him of his appointment to a full professorship in Göttingen as the successor of his teacher Erxleben. The rest of his life was spent in Göttingen. In 1776 he became a member of the Royal Society in Göttingen. In 1785 he was given the post of tutor in mathematics to the three royal princes who were then staying with the bookseller Dieterich, Lichtenberg's

friend; in 1788 as a recognition of those services he was made a Hofrat. In 1793 he was elected a member of the Royal Society in London. Throughout his life he had suffered from a tendency towards hypochondria, but only once was he seriously ill, when a nervous fever prevented him from doing any work at all for two years from 1788 to 1790. He died of an acute inflammation of the lungs on 24 February 1799.

These few dates are the milestones of Lichtenberg's life, a life that from an external point of view knew few excitements and few experiences; the typical life of a German bookworm who sees the world once in his youth and then confines himself in a small university town to a quiet existence, entirely devoted to research and teaching. Yet Lichtenberg's life differs in many respects from that of his contemporaries and colleagues; he anxiously avoided taking part in the social life of the professors and students in Göttingen, and with the advance of years he became more and more of an oddity and an outsider, who only very rarely in letters to his friends and never in conversation revealed his innermost thoughts, but confided them to his secret diary. During the last years of his life he left his house only to spend a few hours dreaming away in his garden outside the town gates. His unsociability and shyness, especially strange in one who in his diaries reveals a profound knowledge of man, may perhaps be explained as the result of the special deformity, a malformation of the spine, from which he suffered from the age of eight. Doubtless this misfortune determined his relationship to his fellow-beings, especially to women. Though the diaries contain an abundance of brilliant epigrams on women in general they do not tell us anything about Lichtenberg's personal relations to them. Only one enthusiastic letter, written in the scientist's youth to his friend Ljungberg, gives us an indication of how sensitive Lichtenberg was to beauty and feminine charms. He was thirty-five years old when, apparently following a sudden whim, he took into his house a young girl, Maria Dorothea Stechard, the daughter of a poor weaver whom he had met when she was selling flowers in the streets of Göttingen. He was just making preparations for his marriage to her, when she died at the age of seventeen. Soon afterwards he formed a second tie which was of exactly the same type as the first. Margarethe Kellner, whom he received into his house when she was twenty, also came from a very poor family. In 1789, when eight children had already been born to them, Lichtenberg entered into a formal marriage with Margarethe, who survived her husband by 49 years. She brought up three sons and three daughters. His preference for simple girls like Maria and Margarethe may at least partly be explained by his

deformity. The man who felt himself wronged by nature was drawn towards these lower middle class girls to whom he could give an education and who would be grateful to him. Lichtenberg's bodily defect, the choice of his two companions, his unsociability and shyness, and the refuge he sought in the secret diary are all closely connected, and from this very detachment sprang the almost overkeen power of observation which forms a special attraction of his aphorisms.

In the introduction to his selection of Lichtenberg's Aphorisms¹ Ernst Vincent says: 'Lichtenberg war ein Mensch zwischen den Zerten.' We can take this utterance as a starting-point, as the usual slogans of the literary historian are inapplicable in Lichtenberg's case. In respect of his literary convictions and his contemporaries he was a representative of Enlightenment. On the other hand, his opinions concerning science, philosophy, art, and religion are in no way in accordance with the current idea of it.

The term Enlightenment is used as a label for a whole century. Almost all developments between 1680 and 1770 are claimed to be part of the spirit of Enlightenment. However, this term is made to comprise spiritual and intellectual currents of a widely different nature. It is called Enlightenment when Gottsched, following Addison's example, popularizes the moral weeklies; when Thomasius introduces the German language as the proper medium for lectures at a German university; it is called Enlightenment when the philosopher Garve declares it to be more important to give as wide as possible a circulation to a few of the ideas of Kant than to discuss Kant in a critical spirit. According to this Enlightenment would mean the 'democratic' task of educating the general public. Kant himself, however, used a wider formula: 'Aufklärung ist der Ausgang des Menschen aus seiner selbstverschuldeten Unmündigkeit', and he explained his statement by saying that the only thing that mattered was 'mit seiner Vernunft nicht passiv, sondern sich selbst gesetzgebend zu sein'. But this position, which greatly differs from the popular intentions of Garve and Gottsched, implies the will to create a scientific system. Thus it is certainly Enlightenment when Leonard Euler, the mathematician, undertakes to explain the whole universe 'more mathematico', even if all common sense has to be denied in the process; and it is equally Enlightenment when rationalist theologians will not accept the miraculous element in revelation, but found their religion on the laws of common sense. Many more instances of such

¹ Lichtenberg, *Aphorismen und Schriften*, ed. Ernst Vincent, Leipzig, 1931.

contradictions could be given, yet they would all but contribute to the formula that by Enlightenment we understand the tendency of man in the eighteenth century to act according to his reason and to use his reasoning power in the right manner. Just, however, as there are widely different opinions as to the true nature of reason, we meet with many different views as to the true meaning of Enlightenment.

This problem of the true meaning of Enlightenment also greatly vexed Lichtenberg. His starting-point was that of the sceptic:

Man spricht viel von Aufklärung und wünscht mehr Licht. Mein Gott, was hilft aber alles Licht, wenn die Leute entweder keine Augen haben oder die, die sie haben, vorsätzlich verschliessen?

This is not yet the attitude of a philosopher but the lament of a disappointed reformer who deplores the stupidity of his fellow-creatures. The philosopher only appears when Lichtenberg transcends his doubt. 'Zweifle an allem wenigstens einmal, und wäre es auch nur der Satz zwei mal zwei ist vier', is the starting-point of his thought, which is supplemented at once by his dictum: 'Zweifel muss nichts weiter sein als Wachsamkeit, sonst kann er gefährlich werden.' This is the Enlightenment of Lichtenberg; it is the attitude of the true scholar who doubts in order to be exact, who is on his guard in order that all his statements may be clear and unequivocal. In this way Lichtenberg arrives at his conclusion: 'Aufklärung in allen Ständen besteht eigentlich in richtigen Begriffen von unsern wesentlichen Bedürfnissen.' Here is a point of close contact with one of the maxims of Goethe: 'Tue nur jeden Tag das Nötige. Was aber ist deine Pflicht? Die Forderung des Tages.' Lichtenberg expresses something very similar when he says: 'Man muss nicht zuviel in Büchern blättern, über Wissenschaften, die man noch zu erlernen hat. Immer nur das Gegenwärtige weggearbeitet.'

It would be a mistake to regard all these sayings as mere moral maxims. They are rather indicative of the dispute about the conception of the 'System', which is the central problem of Enlightenment and furthermore the fundamental problem of all modern science and philosophy. Medieval thought was bound to a unified system, to the order created by the Catholic Church. When this order collapsed, and human reasoning power took the place of church dogma as a guiding principle of thought, the very meaning of the conception of 'System' changed: now it meant a rational order, created by man, comprising all that man can perceive. This new conception of the system finds its expression in the great epistemological theories of Cartesius, Spinoza, Hobbes, and Leibniz. The whole eighteenth century subscribed to the idea of the system; every

thinker of this period knew that Enlightenment could be realized only through a systematic ordering of all problems concerning man, every philosopher talked about the idea of system—yet the very conception of ‘System’ was profoundly misunderstood. Every philosopher of the Enlightenment introduced his own so-called system, proclaiming one or another disintegrated truth, whilst neglecting the need for an all-embracing and satisfactory order of cognition. In the name of Enlightenment men in the eighteenth century followed metaphysical speculations instead of concentrating on epistemology. They mistook a senseless catalogue of mere subject-matter for a sensible order, and Lichtenberg was one of the few who saw the danger of such a development and who fought it:

Wenn unsere jetzt im Schwange gehende registerartige Gelehrsamkeit nicht bald zu ihrem Winterstillstand kommt, so ist allerdings viel zu befürchten. Solche Leute sind so wenig eigentliche Gelehrte als Register Bucher sind.

Kant’s great deed was to destroy that popular idea of Enlightenment, which truly was the very contrary of all that Enlightenment really stood for, and in this task Lichtenberg was one of Kant’s most important assistants:

Wenn man die Menschen lehrte, wie sie denken sollen und nicht ewighin was sie denken sollten: so wird auch dem Missverständnis vorgebeugt. Man kann nicht vorsichtig genug sein in Bekanntmachung eigener Meinungen, die auf Leben und Glückseligkeit hinauslaufen, hingegen nicht emsig genug, Menschenverstand und Zweifel einzuschärfen.

This quotation proves that Lichtenberg broke with all that is commonly called Enlightenment and that is but a mistaken development of the eighteenth century. This conception designates him a disciple of Kant and a teacher of Goethe. Better than all metaphysical speculators of his time Lichtenberg, who never tried to build up a system himself, who never claimed the title of a philosopher, fathomed the great thought that all human knowledge can only become cognition in a sensible system.

It is easy to understand why it was that Lichtenberg, although he had enjoyed the typical education of a German student of his generation, could rise above his fellowmen on such a decisive point: he was one of the few Germans of his epoch who transcended the confines of their homeland and came to know English literature, English philosophy, and English thought. Rudolf Unger,¹ who examined the nationally different forms of European Enlightenment, has stated that the two main currents of the Enlightenment movement are of French and English origin:

¹ Rudolf Unger, *Hamann und die Aufklärung*, Halle, 1925.

France was responsible for the rationalistic doctrine, and it is to England that Europe owes the progress of the empirical, sensualistic philosophy. And Lichtenberg, with all the force of conviction, made Hume's doctrine his own.

But he did not only study Hume; he studied England in general, her way of life, her educational methods, her art, her spiritual mode. It was a singular good fortune for the son of the reactionary province of Hessen to come as a young student to Göttingen where the free atmosphere of Britain prevailed. Göttingen was, under the direction of its outstanding 'Kurator', Gerlach von Münchhausen, one of the few German towns where there was a living intercourse between the two nations. Lichtenberg became tutor to young Englishmen studying in Göttingen, and in this way he quickly mastered the foreign tongue, adapted himself to English ways of thought, and soon, as Lord Boston's guest, he became one of the few German writers who visited England. Lichtenberg received his first decisive impression of England in the social and political sphere: the relations between the social classes as seen in England must have revealed a new world to a German of this time. In the Germany of Lichtenberg's day there were only two ways in which one could orientate oneself politically; one could subscribe to the new French doctrines and declare for revolution, equality of all classes, and abolition of monarchies, as did the best of all young Germans, or one could accept the prevailing conditions—but in that case one was labelled as a reactionary. Now Lichtenberg found in England that over and above these two attitudes there was a third, namely the way of conservative thought in the spirit of common sense. Lichtenberg's diaries are full of the influences of English conservative wisdom:

Es ist kein Zweifel, dass bei aller Ungleichheit der Menschen die Menschen gleich glücklich sein können.

Or:

In keiner Streitigkeit, die ich kenne, sind, glaube ich, die Begriffe so verstellt worden wie in der gegenwärtigen über Freiheit und Gleichheit... Die Gleichheit, die wir verlangen, ist der ertraglichste Grad von Ungleichheit. So vielerlei Arten von Gleichheit es gibt, worunter es furchterliche gibt, so gibt es verschiedene Grade der Ungleichheit, die ebenso furchterlich sind. Von beiden Seiten ist Verderben. Ich bin daher überzeugt, dass die Vernünftigen beider Parteien nicht soweit voneinander liegen, als man glaubt; und dass die Gleichheit der einen Partei und die Ungleichheit der anderen wohl am Ende gar dieselben Dinge mit verschiedenen Namen sein könnten.

It was Lichtenberg's dislike of all the German theorising that continually caused him to refer his fellow countrymen to English ways of living. In

the field of education in particular he again and again advises the following of English principles.

Man lasse die Kinder so viel als möglich tun, halte sie immer zu alteren als sie selbst sind. Schwatze ihnen nicht viel von grossen Männern vor, sondern halte sie womöglich an, andere zu übertreffen. Wer immer angehalten wird, seine Spielkameraden zu übertreffen, der wird im vierzigsten Jahre alle seine Kollegen übertreffen. Aus den Schulen von Eton und Westminster kommen Leute, die, was es auch sein mag, immer lieber tun als schwatzen. Wenn ich mir ein Vergnügen machen will, so denke ich mir einen von unsern fünfzehnjährigen gelehrten Knaben in die Gesellschaft eines fünfzehnjährigen Englanders, der aus der Schule von Eton zurückkommt. Den ersten im Haarbeutel, gepudert, demütig und gespannt, auf den mindesten Druck mit einer Menge Gelehrsamkeit loszugehen, in seinen Meinungen schlechterdings nichts als der im kleinen schlecht kopierte Papa oder Praeceptor. Der Engländer sein reines lockichtes Haar um die Ohren und die Stirn hängen, die Miene blühend, die Hände zerkratzt und auf jedem Knochel eine Wunde. Horaz, Homer und Vergil immer gegenwärtig, in seinen Meinungen bestimmt und eigen, irrt sich tausendmal, aber verbessert sich selbst.

Lichtenberg has been called an Anglomaniac on account of this and similar pronouncements. But just because he was a representative of European Enlightenment, for whom the word patriotism had little significance, he was all the more in a position to measure the nations with their advantages and disadvantages against each other. He noted with particular pleasure in his diary a passage by Kant concerning the contributions of the nations to the sciences: 'Der Deutsche besorgte die Wurzel und den Stamm, der Franzose die Blüten, die Engländer die Früchte und die Italiener die Blätter.' And the clearest passage in which Lichtenberg formulated his task of getting to know his own country when abroad, is to be found in his observation: 'Ich bin nach England gefahren, um deutsch zu lernen.'

Lichtenberg did not express himself connectedly as a writer on all these questions. It is only from casual entries in the diaries that we can recognize to what a great extent English thought entered into his whole style of life. Lichtenberg only wrote about two questions connected with English art: about Garrick and about Hogarth. Neither his notes on Hogarth's engravings nor yet his *Theaterbriefe*, which are principally concerned with Garrick's acting, need explaining; they are descriptions, closely observed studies, where the writer keeps himself in the background as much as possible, betrays his likes and dislikes between the lines and for the rest confines himself strictly to his subject. It is typical of Lichtenberg the thinker, who would rather teach no system at all than the 'Pseudo-Systematik' of the enlightened metaphysicians, that he who could have told his countrymen so much about England confined himself to brief observations on matters of art, and never published his thoughts on England in an ordered sequence. His conception of the right use of

reason and the rôle it plays in Enlightenment are fully laid down in the words quoted above that it is only a question of 'the right conception of our essential needs'.

Lichtenberg's equivocal position with regard to Enlightenment, and over and beyond that the whole problem of the Enlightenment itself, is nowhere revealed as clearly as in his discussions with Lavater. We must once more refer to Rudolf Unger's conception, and to his formula that the German Enlightenment consists of (a) a sensualistic English, and (b) a rationalistic French component, to which was added (c) a specific German development: Pietism. Pietistic religiousness, the German version of Anglo-Saxon Puritanism, had certainly nothing to do with Enlightenment; but all the same it is considered by Rudolf Unger as an 'undercurrent', which went hand in hand with the enlightened tendencies of the century. This perpetual presence of pietistic thought accounts for the fact that there was hardly a 'pure Enlightenment' at all. It was always permeated with elements of pietistic origin, and on account of that the autonomy of reason was called in question. A typical example of this attitude is a hymn of Gellert, dating from the middle of the eighteenth century, which begins:

Wenn ich o Schöpfer Deine Macht
Die Weisheit deiner Wege
Die Liebe, die für alles wacht,
Anbetend überlege...

The 'reasonable' representative of Enlightenment who must always reflect, who conceives of his God deistically as World Creator and Great Artist and as nothing else, nevertheless finds himself impelled to 'adore'. Thus the enlightened doubts every moment in the autonomous right of his reason, in spite of the fact that theoretically he proclaims it.

Now Lavater, that extraordinarily complicated strange phenomenon of an epoch of spiritual high tension, saw the weakness and the limitations of the enlightened position. He saw that Enlightenment betrayed itself every moment, and he dared a general attack on the recognized teachings of his age. He was no 'deist'—to him God was an omnipresent Power. So against rationalistic theologians he stood for the doctrine that miracles such as those that the Bible describes as having been worked by Christ, are as possible to-day in our midst as in ancient times. In the same way he stood for the rights of intuition against the writers and philosophers who reasoned with their intellect, and he founded his science of physiognomy wholly upon the spirit of imagination and intuition—not on the basis of systematic reasoning.

That was the point where he came into conflict with Lichtenberg. The physiognomical rule that 'anima format corpus' has occupied mankind ever since the time of Aristotle. But how does the soul stamp itself on the bodily 'habitus' of men? Lavater did not concern himself much about the fact that for centuries learned men had been seeking the principle by means of which the question of physiognomy could be answered—he 'schaute', he 'ahndete', he gazed at a silhouette, and then he wrote down his impressions; thus arose the series of folio-volumes of his *Physiognomische Fragmente*, which stirred and influenced a whole generation of Germans. And in what after all did Lichtenberg differ from Lavater? He, too, studied the human countenance, he, too, attempted to comprehend man according to the old maxim 'anima format corpus', he, too, wrote down 'Physiognomische Fragmente', which occurred to him by means of observation. 'Die Gesichter der gemeinen Leute auf einer Strasse anzusehen ist jederzeit eins meiner grossten Vergnügen gewesen', he once wrote in his diary; and yet again:

Wir können gar nichts von der Seele sehen, wenn sie nicht in den Mienen sitzt; die Gesichter einer grossen Versammlung von Menschen konnte man eine Geschichte der menschlichen Seele nennen.

Such passages, which only differ through their literary temperament from those of Lavater, abound in Lichtenberg's works. And yet there is a decisive difference between their points of view. Lichtenberg was a scientist, and consequently he enquired into the natural law by means of which he could determine the relationship between soul and countenance. But there is no such law. Lichtenberg recognized that physiognomy was not a science, but a mere 'Prophetie', and he declared with resignation:

Was war am Ende das Resultat aller meiner Bemühungen? Nichts als ein wenig nähere Bekanntschaft mit den Menschen und mir, und dann ein Misstrauen gegen alle Physiognomik, die einen ganzlichen Bruch zwischen ihr und mir veranlasste.

In this respect Lichtenberg seems to be on the side of Enlightenment, because he despairs of the possibility of pursuing physiognomy as a science. His essay 'Über Physiognomik', which appeared in the autumn of 1777 in the 'Göttinger Taschenkalender für 1778', contained the severest criticism which Lavater ever experienced. And this article called forth a literary dispute which excited public opinion for months. Lichtenberg's fundamental objection to Lavater's *Fragments* was that physiognomy lacks all rules; one cannot say why one can read emotions from a countenance (or even, as in Lavater's case, from silhouettes). Physiognomy was prophecy, or at best art, but certainly not science. On the other hand Lichtenberg suggests, as a scientific process, the improvement

of 'Pathognomik', the doctrine which links changes of facial expression with changes of emotion. With this conception Lichtenberg (together with Lessing) became the pioneer of a modern Physiognomy. To consider the muscular reactions, mainly of the face, as the outer expression of emotional conditions is to-day a matter of exact investigation by medical scientists. This modern research develops out of 'Pathognomik', which on its part is a continuation of the old teaching of mimic art; the actor knows exactly how he must move his facial muscles in order to give the onlooker the impression that he is suffering, for instance, pain. The research which deals with that subject is rightly called a true science. From this one can understand the seriousness with which Lichtenberg in his letters from England describes Garrick's play of feature; they were his empirical studies for a first draft of 'Pathognomik'. It is also clear that the representative of 'Sturm und Drang', the 'modern' Lavater, is much less modern in his conception of Physiognomy than Lichtenberg, the representative of the 'old' Enlightenment. And the reason for this is plainly that Lichtenberg is something more than just a representative of Enlightenment.

Even when Lichtenberg deals in terms of Enlightenment, his real place is among those who supplanted it. His attitude to a science whose beginning is closely bound up with the thought of the century proves this most clearly: that is, his connection with psychology or rather with what in Lichtenberg's time was called 'Erfahrungsseelenkunde'. There is no doubt that psychology developed out of the spirit of Enlightenment. If reason is the principle on which the system of cognition is to be erected, then man is certainly the central problem of all scientific and philosophical research. Lichtenberg thought wholly in terms of 'enlightened' science when he continually referred to man as the chief object of his studies. 'The proper study of mankind is man' is a saying that appears in endless variations in Lichtenberg's *Bemerkungen*. But it appears—often enough—in the form of doubt:

Vielleicht ist alles, was wir jetzt von menschlichen Fähigkeiten wissen, noch immer ein sehr kleiner Zirkel, in welchem uns politische und religiöse Rücksichten, falsche Demüthigung vor dem Altertume und Erziehung zu einem angeblichen Zweck einschliessen.

That is already in its essence the call to develop a science of the human soul. It is amazing how modern Lichtenberg appears as soon as he speaks of psychology:

Da dringe ich eben darauf, das ist der eigentliche Mensch nicht, der mit uns lebt, wir müssen ihn jetzt aus der Geschichte heraussuchen.

Or:

Es gehört unter die Vorzüge des Menschen, dass er träumt und es weiss. Man hat schwerlich noch den rechten Gebrauch davon gemacht. Wenn Leute ihre Träume aufrichtig erzählen wollten, da liesse sich der Charakter eher daraus erraten, also aus dem Gesicht.

And it seems like an anticipation of psychoanalysis when we find Lichtenberg regarding religious ideas as mere preludes to a future without any 'myths':

Nach dem was ich mir von der Religion gedenke, so ist es eine Sammlung von Vorschriften zur Glückseligkeit, die der untersuchende Teil der Menschheit (seine Repräsentanten) solange dem ununtersuchenden einzuscharffen sucht, bis sie selbst etwas besseres ausspioniert haben.

That is an idea which, be it true or false, leads far beyond the eudaemonistic theology of the eighteenth century, and presages the method of Sigmund Freud. Writers who examine Lichtenberg's work from a psychoanalytical point of view go so far as to state that he not only anticipated Freud's doctrine of Dreams but even his conceptions of 'Imago' and 'Compensation'.¹

We must consider once again Lichtenberg's position amongst his contemporaries in the field of psychology, and we have as starting-point the above quoted words of Pope and a multitude of learned and literary documents of the age of Enlightenment, which prove that eighteenth-century thought interested itself in a way never known before in man, who became again the 'measure of all things'. One can gather from the history of the novel how during this time external action became of less and less importance, and the processes of the hero's inner life more and more significant. The line of this development passes in German literature from Gellert's *Schwedische Gräfin von G.*, by way of Wieland's and Sophie von la Roche's novels, in a direct line to Goethe's *Werther*. (And it has already been often demonstrated what a decisive part both Richardson and Rousseau played in this development.) No doubt it was more than a mere tendency of Enlightenment which developed the psychological interest of the authors. One can go back again to Rudolf Unger's threefold formula, and note that the psychology of the epoch was drawn from three sources: French rationalism taught man to set himself as the measure of all things, to regard himself as a 'machine' whose reactions can be calculated; English sensualism directed man to experience of his 'ego', it taught him to observe himself and record the results. And then Pietism came in as a third source, and taught man to

¹ R. D. Loewenberg, 'Lichtenberg als Psychologe', *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Neurologie und Psychiatrie*, cxxviii, 1930.

'listen in to himself', not to acknowledge the authority of a 'visible church', but to find the strength for repentance and grace only within himself. Thus man was directed to his own self in three different ways, and while the rationalist and sensualist philosophers taught man to study the emotions of his soul and to use his experience for the perfection of the human race, pietism taught him to profess and confess. Thus one of the most important starting-points of early psychology is the art of literary self-portraiture. Works such as Karl Philipp Moritz's *Anton Reiser* and Heinrich Jung-Stilling's *Lebensgeschichte*, both deriving wholly from pietism, meet the demand which Lichtenberg once made when in an aphorism he conceived a clock, 'die ihrem Besitzer immer um Viertel zuruft: Du . . . , um Halb: Du bist . . . , um Dreiviertel: Du bist ein . . . , und wenn es Voll schlägt: Du bist ein Mensch!'. There can be no doubt: this remark comes from other realms than the above quoted passage about the future of a scientific psychology. For Lichtenberg's psychology is just as equivocal as the century itself; it wished to free itself once and for all from religious thought, as strict rationalism did, and at the same time it recognized the soul as a mysterious region, as yet unexplored.

The question which continually occupied Lichtenberg was: how does one distinguish faith from superstition? Is there a point beyond which we have no longer any right to explain everything in terms of science? However much man relies on his own reason, he yet comes suddenly upon bewildering limitations: 'Ich habe immer gegen den Aberglauben gepredigt und bin für mich immer der ärgste Zeichendeuter.' Lichtenberg knows well that human nature is too complicated to be always explained 'more mathematico'. Thus he once jotted down observations about prayer:

Mich hat einmal die Liebe zu meiner verstorbenen Mutter verleitet, für sie zu beten. Es ist dieses weiter nichts als die Vermenschung, Vermenschlichung alles dessen, wovon wir nichts wissen und nichts wissen können.

From this observation, in which the 'homo religiosus' Lichtenberg conflicts with the rationalist Lichtenberg, he goes on to an entry which carries this thought further. He tells the anecdote of the prayer of the freethinking King Frederick the Great:

da ihn der Wirt von einem Wirtshause oben durch ein Loch in der Decke beten horte: Mein Gott! Mein Gott! was hast du über mich beschlossen.

Lichtenberg adds: 'Jeder greife nur in seinen eigenen Busen, und er wird fühlen, dass diese Geschichte wahr ist.' And Lichtenberg the psychologist and writer draws the conclusion from these observations:

‘Einen Charakter wie den vorhergehenden betenden Freigeist zu schildern. Er ist in der Welt gemein, aber für die Bücher neu.’ This passage is of special significance. It contains the working hypothesis of the new psychology. For it affirms that the figure of the praying freethinker is a typical phenomenon, of which science has hitherto taken no notice. The ‘books’, the theories, always differentiate between ‘enlightened’ and ‘superstitious-orthodox’ men. Lichtenberg, who himself had fought on the side of the enlightened against reactionary narrow-minded fanatics, and who conceded to human reason the highest rights, surprises himself in a belief in supernatural happenings, is ashamed of praying and suddenly recognizes that what he had taken for his personal weakness was in reality a quite general human attitude. With this he enters into a new scientific tradition which is characterized by the attempt to work out a new ‘Erfahrungsseelenkunde’.

From the dogma that mankind should be the chief study of man, a new science was to be evolved; that is to say one sought empirically the material from which to learn how men behaved in this or that situation. Karl Philipp Moritz and Salomon Maimon started to this end the *Magazin für Erfahrungsseelenkunde*, in which peculiar experiences of man’s inner life were collected; Jacob Hermann Obereit recommended the Munich Academy to incorporate a class for ‘Tugendreizungskunst’; on the medical side in Brown’s School pre-romantic thinkers worked out systems of medicine which were based on the relations between body and soul—and all these experiments came from men who held themselves more or less remote from the enlightenment movement. Lichtenberg also was dissatisfied with the theoretically proclaimed distinction between enlightened and superstitious men; the realization of the mysteriousness of the human soul turned him into a psychologist. The first urge to psychology certainly arose from the spirit of Enlightenment, but in psychological research, Enlightenment overcame itself. Lichtenberg represented this development very plainly: he attempted to practise psychology with the means of Enlightened—failed—arrived at amazingly ‘modern’ theories, was frightened of the consequences of his discoveries, in which the main principles of rationalism were suddenly denied—and confined himself to the entries in his diary. The old developments are outworn, the new not yet established—in his heart of hearts Lichtenberg is with the innovators, in his reason on the side of the enlightened, in whose spirit he was brought up: so he resigns himself, for he fears nothing so much as the confusion which arises when men ‘mit dem Herz denken und mit dem Kopf fühlen’.

Lichtenberg's relationship to the literature of his age has been reserved for this concluding stage of our study because here there are special difficulties to be overcome which can more easily be explained after the foregoing analysis. Most writers who have dealt with Lichtenberg have naturally started out from his verdicts on writers and books, and have established that he came out very definitely on the side of Enlightenment and against the 'Geniewesen' of 'Sturm und Drang'. But Lichtenberg's pronouncements on the literature of his age are definitely influenced by a personal motive: the new movement of 'Sturm und Drang' was borne by the students of the very University of which he was a teacher, while most of Lichtenberg's colleagues were more or less in sympathy with Enlightenment. There is a revealing entry which clearly illustrates Lichtenberg's personal attitude to this question:

Ich habe in meinen Universitätsjahren und nachher enthusiastische Bewunderer von Haller und welche von Klopstock gekannt. Die von Haller, ich rede hier bloss von dem Dichter, waren gemeiniglich Leute von Geist und Nachdenken, die ihre Brotwissenschaft nie vernachlässigten. Hingegen mit Klopstocks enthusiastischen Bewunderern verhielt es sich gerade umgekehrt. Die Meisten waren unausstehliche Pinsel, denen vor den Wissenschaften, die sie eigentlich erlernen sollten, ekelte. Musenalmanache waren eine Hauptlektüre für sie. Waren sie Juristen, so lernten sie nichts; waren es Theologen, so wurden es frühzeitige Prediger, und die kamen noch am besten fort. Mediziner die enthusiastisch für Klopstock eingenommen gewesen waren, habe ich nicht gekannt. Mir ist nicht bewusst, dass ein deklariertes Bewunderer von Haller hernach etwas frappant einfältiges geschrieben hatte; hingegen ist es eine ganz bekannte Sache, dass unter Klopstocks eifrigsten Bewunderern einige der größten Flachköpfe der Nation sind. Das Faktum ist wahr. Erklären kann ich es selbst nicht.

Lichtenberg continually concerned himself with the explanation of this 'Faktum', and he always arrived at the same result, that Klopstock's disciples did not make proper use of their intellect:

Ich lese die Tausend und eine Nacht, den Robinson Crusoe, den Gilblas, den Findling tausendmal lieber als die Messiade; ich wollte zwei Messiaden für einen kleinen Teil des Robinson Crusoe hingeben. Unsere meisten Dichter haben, ich will nicht sagen, nicht Genie genug, sondern nicht Verstand genug, einen Robinson Crusoe zu schreiben

And another time Lichtenberg writes more categorically: 'Starke Empfindung, deren sich viele rühmen, ist nur allzuoft eine Folge des Verfalls der Verstandeskkräfte'. That certainly looks as if Lichtenberg belonged heart and soul to the Enlightenment, and always supported intellect against feeling. But his understanding of English ways of life makes us assume that he was thinking rather of the difference between common sense and intellectual exaltation. And all the previous observations show us clearly how many tendencies were at work in Lichtenberg towards the overthrow of Enlightenment. The perusal of his notes on poets and writers could only strengthen this impression.

Lichtenberg's clear preference for English literature is very obvious. 'Die englischen Genies gehen vor der Mode her, die deutschen hinterdrein.' Many more passages of this kind could be easily quoted. And where Lichtenberg in his diaries refers to masters whom he chiefly honours, there are always three names: Shakespeare, Hogarth, Garrick. He is ever and again setting out to write a big work, which should illustrate for his contemporaries from this triple constellation what the word 'genius' really stands for, namely the inborn capacity 'eine Verrichtung vorzüglich zu betreiben', without what Lichtenberg called 'mannerism'. But this book, Lichtenberg's 'Orbis pictus', a text-book for actors and novelists, remained unfinished, as did so much else that he started to write in his leisure hours.

The English poet who after Shakespeare had Lichtenberg's particular affection was Milton. Lichtenberg was strongly attracted to him by the union of learning and creative power which they had in common. On the other hand there is no doubt that he had no feeling for Pope's art, and Swift also did not mean as much to him as the writers who are fond of calling Lichtenberg the 'German Swift' seem to believe. Certainly he imitated the great satirist in his fragment *Lorenz Eschenheimers empfindsame Reise nach Laputa*, but he had a much too unpolitical mind to be able to share the biting hate of the great Irishman. His favourite authors were Defoe, Fielding, and Sterne, and all the unfinished sketches for more ambitious works which he left behind breathe the spirit of Sterne; Lichtenberg schooled himself in the satirical English prose of his century. Along with his favourite poets he occasionally mentions also Goldsmith and Gray.

Lichtenberg's contacts with Greek and Roman literature are few. He mentions Pindar, and praises Horace, whom he honours as a master of Rococo-poetry. Names of French authors also only occasionally occur in his notes.

On the other hand he deals very fully in his *Bemerkungen* with the German literature of his age. And we can easily divide his favourite authors into two groups: some he was fond of as they had much in common with him, they represented that spirit to which he knew himself related, and some he appreciated because they taught the joy of life and unfettered merriment, realms of existence from which he knew himself to be shut out by his temperament.

Lessing, Wieland, Kästner schreiben unter den Deutschen die beste Prosa—Ich beneide sehr wenige Menschen, etwa Wielanden, Sterne, den Horaz, Kästner und, wenn ich etwas Wein getrunken habe, den Herrn Gleim—Die grossen Medaillen

Gellert, Hagedorn usw. hat die Natur eingeschmolzen und scheint sie uns nun in kleinen Kurantsorten wiederzugeben.

There are many more entries on these lines; it is always the same little group of names which appears when Lichtenberg pays his tribute of reverence. Lessing, and Kästner the outstanding epigrammatist, teacher and friend of Lichtenberg in Göttingen, were 'wahlverwandt' to him; he schooled himself through their work for his own writings. His affection for Wieland sprang from other sources. 'Wieland hat für das Herz gesungen und gesprochen', runs one phrase, and in another place he says:

Wieland ist ein grosser Schriftsteller, er hat verwegene Blicke in eine Seele getan. Mitten in dem Genuss seiner Empfindungen greift er nach Worten und trifft, wie durch einen Trieb, unter tausenden von Ausdrücken oft den, der augenblicklich Gedanken wieder zu Empfindungen macht. Dieses hat er mit dem Shakespeare gemein. Ich meine hiermit nicht, dass er ihn nachahmt. Sterne hat er vielleicht nachgeahmt. Wieland ist weit über alles, was ich kenne, in den Schilderungen der sinnlichen Wollust, so wie sie sich einer schonen Einbildungskraft entkörpert.

This quotation is of the utmost significance; it not only shows what Lichtenberg admired in Wieland, it reveals what Lichtenberg expected of himself as author: psychological insight, precise wording, unity of thought and feeling. He remained a modest 'Aphoristiker' just because he had placed his aim as writer high enough to learn from Shakespeare, from Sterne, from Wieland.

By comparison with these masters all others meant much less to him. He had a certain preference for many of the less 'sugary' anacreontic poets, in whose work he saw 'naturalness', especially for Hagedorn, Gellert, and Gleim, and he valued Liscow's satirical vigour. He maintained a respectful distance from the representatives of Berlin Enlightenment, from Nicolai, Mendelssohn, Biester, and Bernoulli. The only one of this circle who was nearer to him was Lambert, Kant's outstanding predecessor, and again it is interesting to observe that Lichtenberg felt himself allied to a man who was a philosopher and mathematician and at the same time a Moravian, that is, a convinced Christian of pietistic colouring.

All the dislike, however, of which Lichtenberg was capable, concentrated itself on the 'Originalgenies' of the 'Sturm und Drang':

Es gibt eine Art von leerem Geschwätz, dem man durch Neuigkeit des Ausdrucks, unerwartete Metaphern, das Ansehen von Fülle gibt. Klopstock und Lavater sind Meister darin.—Es gibt eine Art von gekünsteltem Unsinn, den der Halbköpfige leicht für tiefe Weisheit, ja wohl gar für das Wehen des Genies hält, erstimulierte Ausbrüche eines fundamentalen Enthusiasmus, ein fieberhaftes Haschen nach Originalismus ohne Richtigkeit der Empfindung, in welchem der Primaner allerorten Shakespearsche Inspiration zu wittern glaubt. Fünf gegen Eins, der Mann, der es geschrieben hat, ist ein Tropf, der mehr scheinen will, als er ist.

In other words, Lichtenberg does not turn against the 'Genies' merely from the standpoint of the Enlightenment; his calm restrained way of thought is opposed to a scheme of things, in which feeling is everything and reason counts for nothing. Lichtenberg overlooked the fact that the 'Geniebewegung' was a necessary reaction to the platitudes of Enlightenment, and that it was therefore bound to overshoot the mark. And caught in this error he turned not only against Klopstock, the fêted leader of the 'Göttinger Hain', but also against Goethe. There are some very severe entries against Goethe in his notebooks:

Die schönste Stelle im 'Werther' ist die, wo er den Hasenfuss erschießt—Gotz von Berlichingen wird so wenig in Drury Lane aufgeführt werden als je die Kardinale einen Landsvater in der Peterskirche machen werden.

—and (most bitter of all):

Sie ist am furore Wertherino gestorben.

Although Lichtenberg later revised his views in the light of Goethe's mature work, it never came to a cordial relationship between the two men, and when Goethe sent his scientific works to Lichtenberg and asked for the expert's advice he only received very inadequate and chilly answers from Göttingen. This was one of the barriers which Lichtenberg could not transcend. With characteristic shrewdness he recognized those who were really responsible for the 'Genietreiben' of the young generation: Klopstock, Goethe, and Lavater, and he directed his attacks mainly against these three men, while the normal representatives of 'Sturm und Drang' were attacked without any individual references:

Sie glauben oft, um ein schöner Geist zu sein, müsse man etwas liederlich leben und gleichsam das Genie mit verdorbenen Sitten fettmachen.

This tone runs through all entries in Lichtenberg's diary. Yet he was always prepared to acknowledge differences and to make exceptions. Thus he recognized Bürger's importance, although Bürger was in close touch with the 'Göttinger Hain', and thus also he concerned himself seriously with that singular figure Jean Paul. He traced the inheritance of Sterne in Jean Paul and named him 'einen allmächtigen Gleichnisschöpfer'. But all the same he was too level-headed to follow Jean Paul in all his romantic vagaries:

Jean Paul ist doch zuweilen unertraglich und wird noch unerträglicher werden. Wenn er wieder von vorn anfängt, wird er gross werden.

Lichtenberg never considered the literature of his age without reference to all the spiritual movements in which it developed. When he attacked the 'Odengeschnaube im Musenalmanach' and advised the

'Originaldichter' that instead of heading their poems with the type of metre they should rather give the train of thoughts, viz.: '000/000/00', that was not only an aesthetic verdict but at the same time a pronouncement about the ideas which the 'Geniebewegung' contributed to the mind of the age. And he made the same reproaches again and again: the cult of feeling at the expense of intellect produces mannerism and inaccuracy. 'Von allem was ausgerechnet wird in der Welt, geschieht zwei Drittel gedankenlos'. That is one of the fundamental notes of all Lichtenberg's contemporary criticism. And he certainly never expressed it more strikingly than in the truly classical passage:

Taglich zu sehen wie Leute zum Namen Genie kommen, wie der Kellersesel zum Namen Tausendfuss, nicht weil sie soviele Fusse haben, sondern weil die meisten nicht bis auf vierzehn zählen wollen, hat gemacht, dass ich keinem mehr ohne Prüfung glaube.

Men are inaccurate, and they pose, and Lichtenberg knows no better aim than continually to call for objectivity and naturalness. He is prepared to accept any conception if only it is lucid and serves 'zur Belehrung und Besserung Anderer'. He was convinced that Rousseau's thesis of the natural child which is spoiled by education is wrong, that on the contrary every human being is capable of all possibilities from the beginning onwards; man is 'perfektibel und korruptibel'. This conviction explains all his educational theories: men should be brought up to 'Objektivität und Natürlichkeit', and they should not be brought to believe that perfectibility is a gift. Lichtenberg teaches a liberal conception of mankind open to all progress and averse from any desultoriness, and it stamps itself on his political bias in the same way as on his aesthetic judgements and educational principles:

Man reisse nicht gleich ein Gebäude ein, das etwas unbequem ist und stecke sich dadurch in grossere Unbequemlichkeiten. Man mache kleine Verbesserungen.

The man who could speak in such a way in Germany in the year 1770 while all round him the world echoed with revolutionary demands must certainly have passed the school of English thinking: it was only his grasp of English tradition which enabled Lichtenberg to walk through his age untouched by all the current movements which came into fashion during his lifetime.

But it was the same English empiricistic tradition which made his way to Kant more difficult for Lichtenberg as thinker. Kant's imperishable achievement was that he radically altered the starting-point of philosophy. In the place of metaphysics he set epistemology, and in the place of speculation on the so-called 'last questions' the philosophic answer to the platonic problem what cognition really means. Lichtenberg

enthusiastically made Kant's ideas his own. He recognized in Kant the man who tackled philosophical questions with the methods of the scientist and not with the pseudo-methods of the *bel esprit*, and that led him at once to the side of critical philosophy. But his training under the empiricists left Lichtenberg at a standstill when he had gone half-way: he was too much accustomed to the methods of applied science, to work with microscope, telescope, and measuring instruments, to be able to grasp why Kant had to build up his system from pure mathematics: 'Die nähere Kenntniss der Muskeln und Nerven wird uns weder bessere Klavierspieler noch bessere Tänzer geben.' Such passages reveal Lichtenberg's distance from Kant's system of criticism; here speaks the empiricist, who believes in weighing and measuring, and thinks usefulness the ultimate aim of science. Lichtenberg never overcame this barrier, and one can follow in his notes the constant swaying between moral and theoretical thinking.

He found his balance in religion. One of the striking proofs of Lichtenberg's aloofness from Enlightenment is that his faith was fed from quite other sources than that of the rationalistic teaching of 'Glückseligkeit', which was spread abroad amongst his deistical contemporaries. Lichtenberg's faith was quite his own, he did not develop it by means of philosophy, he merely realized with amazement (and often with a certain reluctance) that he believed and was convinced:

Der Glaube an einen Gott ist Instinkt, er ist dem Menschen natürlich wie das Gehen auf zwei Beinen, modifiziert wird er freilich bei manchen und bei manchen erstickt. Regelmässiger ist er unentbehrlich.

Thus belief has nothing to do with theology, Christianity 'ist das vollkommenste System, Ruhe und Glückseligkeit in der Welt zu befördern', if it is 'von dem verfluchten Pfaffengeschmier gesäubert'. God—and here speaks Lichtenberg the critical philosopher—is not to be grasped by arguments, he is 'die grosse qualitas occulta'.

So far his religious life fits without difficulty into the portrait of Lichtenberg as we have sketched it up to now; he proceeds from the idea of autonomy of reason, turns against every exaggeration and assents to every genuine feeling which appears natural and sensible. The great surprise which Lichtenberg gives the onlooker is only apparent where he—rarely enough—speaks of the teachers who influenced his religious point of view:

Jacob Böhme, der Mann, dessen Schriften alles das gediegen und in einer festen Masse enthalten, was uns seine albernern Nachfolger verdunnt und verwoben übergeben, ist und bleibt einer der ersten Schriftsteller unserer Nation.

That is an amazing statement: Lichtenberg the empiricist, the incisive, cool-headed calculator, the pupil of the English and of Kant, who so often took up the cudgels of Enlightenment against the 'Genies', professes the mysticism of Jakob Böhme, and he discovers the philosopher of Silesian Baroque a generation before the romantic thinkers inaugurated their 'Böhme-Renaissance'. In this case also Lichtenberg's love for England can be held partly responsible, as during the eighteenth century there was a sort of Bohme-school in England, even though only beneath the surface, while the mystic tradition in Germany seemed to have died out. And now the coolest and calmest thinker of his generation proclaims himself a mystic in religion. This proves again that there is a direct way leading from rationalistic to mystical modes of thought, and that a man like Lichtenberg was better fitted to carry on the great tradition of an unorthodox piety which has never perished in Germany than were the 'Genies' of Lavater's school who were guided solely by moods and feelings. From this point there opens up a wider view of the great problem how Enlightenment overcame itself: the pupil of Hume and Kant, the admirer of the 'praying freethinker', who had schooled himself in literature through Sterne and Wieland, in his thinking through Lessing and Kästner, was able as 'homo religiosus' to embrace the great tradition of mysticism. That is the ultimate paradox which makes Lichtenberg so many-sided, and gives every one of his works a manifold deeper meaning: because he was genuine, without artifice, and only intent on listening to his inner self, 'ein Mensch mit seinem Widerspruch', he lived between the ages, not bound to any fashion, an independent thinker—and 'wo er einen Spass macht, liegt ein Problem verborgen'.

WERNER J. MILCH.

LONDON.

HOLDING DOWN THE TROCHEES

YEARS ago in my *Heine* (Methuen, 1928) when speaking of the poem *Vutzliputzli* I wrote the words:

Trochees readily incline in German to slip over into a rising iambic rhythm, and they do so frequently with Heine, as, for instance, in *Spanische Atriden*. Here, however, Heine keeps them down to a regular heavy tread, to a tom-tom like beat, which is the most effective rhythmic form possible for the tale of barbaric horrors which he unfolds. He displays a wonderful skill in the employment of long heavy words and weighty compounds, which remind us of the mastery of his *Nordseebilder*. A considerable number of the lines are filled by two compounded tetrasyllables, which leave no possible doubt as to the rhythmic movement.

At about that time I was moved to attempt a solution of the great metrical riddle on which so much time and so much ink has been expended—the distinction between trochaic and iambic verse in English and German. Among other things I compiled elaborate statistical tables, and hoped that the facts when established would confirm the theory with which I had started. What that theory was does not now matter, for though I set out hopefully, the more I worked at my demonstration the more my ‘system’ disintegrated under my hands. Now, as so often happens with prosodists, I have suddenly seen the light.

The reason, as I now see it, why I could not establish any general difference between trochaic and iambic verse is that in English and German there is no natural trochaic verse, but only trochaic lines in which the falling rhythm is maintained deliberately by the use of a very definite and consciously employed linguistic material, failing which the natural iambic rhythm inevitably reasserts itself. There is no need to go over the well-trodden ground again, or to quote the various authorities on the subject. One attempt to cut the Gordian knot is seen in that theory which reduces trochees and iambs to a common formula by treating the first unaccented syllable of iambic verse as anacrusis, thus making them both trochaic:

$$\begin{array}{c} (\times) / \times / \acute{\times} / \times / \times / \\ / \times / \times / \times / \times / \times \end{array}$$

It is easy in that way to produce uniformity on paper and for the eye, but it is merely mechanical and proves nothing.

In English and in German ‘trochaic’ metres are much less common than iambic. The most frequent ‘trochaic’ measure is the four-foot ‘trochaic’ line, and to illustrate my theory I am going to take two long poems in that metre, *The Song of Hiawatha* by Longfellow and Heine’s

Vitzliputzli. In *Hiawatha* the vast majority of the lines are, however, in fact three-foot trochees with disyllabic anacrusis, the first two syllables being in most cases light and unaccented. The commonest type of line has the metrical scheme

× × | / × | × × | / ×

That might be described as the minimum filling of the line, and the trochaic movement is reinforced in varying degrees, many of the lines being strongly packed with natural trochaic words. The following are typical lines from near the beginning of the poem illustrating these features:

And the pleasant water-courses,
You could trace them through the valley,
By the rushing in the Spring-time,
By the alders in the Summer,
By the white fog in the Autumn,
By the black lne in the Winter;
And beside them dwelt the singer,
In the vale of Tawasentha,
In the green and silent valley.

One of the chief means of asserting the trochaic rhythm is the employment of trochaic words at the end of the line. Of the first 100 lines in *Hiawatha* eighty have such an ending. But the most effective means of all is in the use of tetrasyllabic words forming two trochaic feet, especially if they occur at the end of the line. They offer the most powerful resistance of all to the iambic urge. Such words are found in *Hiawatha* mainly in the 'proper names'. And is it a mere coincidence that the name of the hero himself is such a word? Or did the name itself (as with *Vitzliputzli*) suggest the metre? There are in the whole poem 474 such 'proper names' at the ends of lines. In some cases too the tetrasyllables are preceded by very heavy trochees:

Called him Strong-Heart, Soan-ge-taha!
Called him Loon-Heart, Mahn-go-taysee!

Yet in spite of all the trochaic metre is not always firmly held down, but is frequently escaping into the natural iambic rhythm of English verse, e.g.

Young and beautiful was Wabun;
He it was who brought the morning,
He it was whose silver arrows
Chased the dark o'er hill and valley;
He it was whose cheeks were painted
With the brightest streaks of crimson,
And whose voice awoke the village,
Called the deer, and called the hunter.

In *Vitzliputzli* the trochees are much more firmly held, the lines are for the most part actually what they profess to be, four-foot trochees, and escape into the iambic rhythm is rare. As in *Hiawatha* the great majority of the lines end with a trochaic word. But what is most striking is the use of the tetrasyllabic words spoken of above. There are few proper names of that type as in *Hiawatha*, though we have Vitzliputzli, Montezuma and a few others. But the tetrasyllables coined by the poet himself are very numerous. He even has a few hexasyllabic words, e.g. 'Namens-kameradschaft', 'Rüstungsarabesken', 'balustradenart'gen'. Many whole lines consist of two tetrasyllables, e.g.

Ausgestopfte Dialekte
Hunderttausend Freudenlampen
Waldharzfackeln, Pechkranzfeuer
Kolossalen Bauwerk-Monstren
Kannibalen-Charivari.

A good instance of their massed resistance to the iambic urge is seen in two successive strophes towards the end of the poem:

Auch ein altes Sprüchwort gibt es:	Diese ist es, die mir zürnet,
Weiberwille, Gotteswille—	Sie, die stolze Himmelsfürstin,
Doppelt ist der Gotteswille,	Eine Jungfrau sonder Makel,
Wenn das Weib die Mutter Gottes.	Zauberkundig, wunderthatig.

The various features discussed above and the effect Heine achieves by them are well illustrated in the following strophes:

In gedrängten Engpasskampfen	Lähmte, hemmte sie im Kampfe,
Boten g'ringen Vorteil heute	Und das teuflische Metall
Alteuropas strenge Kriegskunst,	Ward nicht bloss der armen Seele,
Feuerschlünde, Harnisch, Pferde.	Sondern auch dem Leib verderblich.
Viele Spanier waren gleichfalls	Mittlerweile ward der See
Schwer bepackt mit jenem Golde,	Ganz bedeckt von Kahnen, Barken;
Das sie jungst erpresst, erbeutet—	Schützen sassen drin und schossen
Ach, die gelbe Sundenlast	Nach den Brücken, Flossen, Furten.

Heine certainly succeeds in his long poem in holding down the trochees, and, as has been said, escape into the iambic rhythm is rare. We can see how he achieves the desired effect and what deliberate management of the linguistic material it entails. And consideration of his *tour de force* only confirms the view that for German no less than for English verse the rising iambic rhythm is alone spontaneous and natural.

H. G. ATKINS.

LONDON.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

NICHOLAS BRETON AND 'A SMALE HANDFULL OF FRAGRANT FLOWERS'

It is with diffidence that I venture to dispute the verdict of Grosart,¹ and more recently of Professor Hyder Rollins,² that Nicholas Breton was emphatically not the author of *A Smale handfull of fragrant Flowers, selected and gathered out of the louely garden of sacred scriptures, fit for any Honorable or woorshipfull Gentlewoman to smell vnto. Dedicated for a Newe-yeeres gyft, to the honorable and vertuous Lady, the Lady Sheffield. By N.B. Imprinted at London by Richard Iones, 1575.*³ I have not, it may seem to the reader, any more positive evidence to offer for Breton's authorship, than Professor Rollins had to offer against it: but at least the evidence supporting both contentions should be weighed before the arguments against Breton being the author of this little book are endorsed as indisputable proofs.

To begin with, as Professor Rollins states, the designation 'N.B.' on the title-page, instead of Breton's more usual style 'N.B. Gent.', contrasts with the usage in the two volumes of poems published in 1577, *The workes of a young wyt* and *A Floorish vpon Fancie*; though the separate title-page of *The toyes of an idle head* appended to the latter is inscribed 'By the same Auctor, N.B.' The two anthologies published by Richard Jones as Breton's work, *Brittons Bowre Of Delightes* and *The Arbor of amorous Deuises*, use the style 'N.B. Gent.'; and so do various of his later works: but the 'gentleman' does not appear after his name in *Auspicante Iehoua*, *The Strange Fortunes Of Two Excellent Princes*, *Wonders Worth The Hearing*, *A Poste with a Packet of Madde Letters* and *A Merrie Dialogue. Fantasticks, The Figure of Foure* and *I Pray you be not Angrie*, three of Breton's recognized works, are signed, as is *A Smale handfull of fragrant Flowers*, with a plain 'N.B.'

It is not impossible that Breton should have been in a position to dedicate his book to Lady Sheffield, and to compliment the Queen and the ladies of the court in January 1575/6. During the years 1575-7 George Gascoigne, Breton's step-father and a pronounced influence on his early work, was a self-appointed court poet to Queen Elizabeth and

¹ *The Works of Nicholas Breton*, ed. A. B. Grosart (1879), I, lxxiii.

² H. E. Rollins, 'Nicholas Breton and *A Smale handfull of fragrant Flowers*', *Huntington Library Bulletin*, no. 9 (April 1936), pp. 27-35.

³ From the unique copy in the Huntington Library: there is an inaccurate reprint in Thomas Park, *Heliconia* (1836), I.

her train: amongst the dames of the court singled out for praise in *The grief of joye* we find the name of Lady Sheffield.¹ Nicholas Breton might have dedicated his little volume to this lady at Gascoigne's instigation; from whom, too, might have come the idea of presenting a patroness with a new year's gift. On the same day that N.B. dedicated his handful of flowers to Douglas Sheffield, Gascoigne presented the Queen with a fine manuscript copy of his *The tale of Hemetes the Heremyte* translated into four languages.² This was followed up on the next ensuing New Year's Day (1 January 1577) by the presentation of *The grief of joye*³ to her Majesty; and the sending of a letter of greeting to Sir Nicholas Bacon (Breton's kinsman).⁴

In the *Primordium* at the beginning of *The workes of a young wyt* (1577), Breton describes them as 'the first fruites of my brayne'; and states that this is 'the first tyme that I stird my brayne'. On the evidence of these statements and for other reasons, Professor Rollins⁵ has shown that, although printed a few months later than *A Floorish vpon Fancie*, *The workes of a young wyt* was actually the earlier composition. Breton was about twenty-two in 1577,⁶ which by Elizabethan standards would be rather old for the boyish tone of *The workes of a young wyt* as revealed in such lines as

Shal I then write of warres? oh no, I am too yong.
I neuer seruice saw in field, then I must hold my tongue.

I am inclined to believe that most of the poems in *The workes of a young wyt* were written prior to January 1576: and that therefore the prefatory remarks about them being the first fruits of his brain do not exclude the possibility of Breton's authorship of *A Smale handfull of fragrant Flowers*. And even if *The workes of a young wyt* were not written until after *A Smale handfull*, Breton might have thought it better for his reputation to remain silent about this early poetical venture. The language of N.B.'s Dedication to Lady Sheffield, describing *A Smale handfull* as 'the godly worke of a simple scholler, willing by dayly practice to grow

¹ *The Works of George Gascoigne*, ed. Cunliffe, II, 529.

² Preserved in the British Museum, MS. Reg. 18 A 49 (*The Works of George Gascoigne*, ed. Cunliffe, II, 473-510).

³ Preserved in the British Museum, MS. Reg. 18 A 61 (*The Works of George Gascoigne*, ed. Cunliffe, II, 511-57).

⁴ Preserved in the MSS. of the Marquis of Townshend (*Hist. MSS. Comm.*); and printed by B. M. Ward, 'George Gascoigne and his circle', *The Review of English Studies*, XI (1926), 37.

⁵ H. E. Rollins, 'Nicholas Breton's *The workes of a young wyt*', *Studies in Philology*, XXXIII (1936), 119.

⁶ His elder brother, Richard, was born on 25 November 1550 (*Inquisition post mortem on William Breton*, 1567). Professor Sisson has kindly communicated to me his discovery of the signature of 'Nicholas Brittainne' as one of the witnesses of the will of Roger Poole, Boar's Head, Cheapside. The will was made in 1609, and Breton gave his age as 54.

vnto more & exacter ripeness of vnderstanding', and giving Lady Sheffield credit for being 'redy to accept the simple gift of a yong and vnskilful husbandman...redy to prefer the base & coūtreȳ mā's pen, to the end that I might hereafter take the more heart of grace, to attempt a more substantial peece of worke' is entirely appropriate to Nicholas Breton in 1575-6. The promise to produce some more substantial work is reiterated in the prefaces to *The workes of a young wyt* and *The toyes of an idle head*.

A Smale handfull of fragrant Flowers is composed of several sections: a title-page and a dedication signed 'N.B.'; 'Iohn Parcels pamphlet in the prayse of this handful of flowers'; 'The booke to the reader'; 'The author to his Lady in verse', signed 'G.T.'; 'The names of all the floures conteyned in this posie with the proper vse therof'; and 'A prayer for Gentlewomen'. The uniform style of all these sections suggests that John Parcel and G.T. are fictitious persons, and that Nicholas Breton was responsible for the whole book: just as the G.T., H.W. and the Printer in *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* (1573) probably disguise the real author, George Gascoigne. Professor Rollins opines that 'since Triata,¹ Lucrece, the Queen of Sheba and Susanna are stressed in G.T.'s signed poem, and in the unsigned posy, probably G.T. wrote both'.² The following lines from the signed poem:

But synce that *Sabbas* wisdome great,
in honour yours doth raigne,
I must dear Ladie wish to you
as wel, as to the trayne.
For why? the garland that you weare
is euer fresh and greene
And serues most fit in Court therwith,
to tende vpon a Queene

seem to come from the same fount of inspiration as John Parcel's

The flowres thereof may well delyght,
A seconde peareles *Saba* queene,
Because they are continuall greene.

Compare also G.T.'s

Your wysedome may conceiue the Larke,
More daintier than the Kight

and John Parcel's

The little Bee fayre Ladies all
Bringes more encrease then doth the Kight.³

¹ So written in both poems in error for Triaria.

² In the article previously cited, *Huntington Library Bulletin* (April 1936).

³ Cf. Breton, *The Honour of Valour* (1604), Dedication, 'A Larke is worth a Kite'.

The verse and diction of *A Smale handfull of fragrant Flowers* are not so unlike that of Breton's early works as to make his authorship out of the question. There are frequent parallels in *A Floorish vpon Fancie* to the weak and false rhymes found in *A Smale handfull*. Breton's penchant for allegory, frequently revealed in *The workes of a young wyt* and *A Floorish vpon Fancie*, make him a likely author of 'The names of all the floures conteyned in this posie with the proper vse thereof', in which each flower is a vertue such as chastity, constancy, etc. The word *pamphlet* meaning a poem, which Professor Rollins notes is not given in the *New English Dictionary*,¹ was constantly so used by Breton and Gascoigne. The title-page of *A Floorish vpon Fancie* reads 'to which are annexed manie pretie pamphlets'.² the commentary supplied to the poems in *The workes of a young wyt* says of one poem 'my Muse likes so well of this Pamphlette...': and in the paragraph on 'Spring' in *Fantasticks*, Breton says it is the season when 'Pallas and her Muses try the Poets in their Pamphlets'. Gascoigne draws a distinction between a pamphlet and a poem:

Marie indeede I may not compare Pamphlets vnto Poems, neither yet may iustly aduant for our native contrimen, that they haue hitherto (translations excepted) any such notable volume, as haue bene by Poetes of Antiquitie.³

In connexion with John Parcel's praise of the book because

It is no gaude nor trifle wayne

I think it is worth noting how frequently the words 'trifle', 'gaud', 'vain' and 'idle' recur in *The workes of a young wyt* and *A Floorish vpon Fancie*: in the latter, for example, fancy teaches the poet

To take delight in gauds, and foolish trifling toyes.

Volumes of poetry embodying in their titles the idea that they are bunches of flowers, garlands, arbours or paradises were popular in the late sixteenth century; and many of them were printed by Richard Jones, including *Brittons Bowre Of Delightes* (1591) and his *The Arbor of amorous Deuises* (1597). His *The Figure of Foure* has for its subtitle 'or a handfull of sweet flowers'.⁴ Nicholas Breton is the only author with the initials N.B. whom we know to have had a hand in similar compilations also published by Richard Jones; and until there is further evidence to the

¹ A small note in the *N.E.D.* under 'pamphlet', says that it was used in the seventeenth century for *issues* of single plays, romances, poems, etc.

² Cf. *A gorgeous Gallery* (1578), 'Pretie pamphlets of T. Proctor'.

³ *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres* (1573), the prefatory letter signed G.T.

⁴ Ent. to N. Ling on 10 October 1597: the only surviving edition of the first part is dated 1631. The unique copy is in the Huntington Library. Grosart was only able to print the second part in *The Works of Nicholas Breton* (1879).

contrary this fact, together with the foregoing considerations, disposes me to regard the attribution of *A Smale handfull of fragrant Flowers* to him as correct.

JEAN ROBERTSON.

LIVERPOOL.

THE DEMONIC FINALE OF 'CHRISTABEL'

Mr B. R. McElderry, Jr., has recently argued that Dr Gillman's reported plan of Coleridge's for the completion of *Christabel* is a 'sound and credible' one.¹ Mr McElderry and Dr Gillman are about as convincing as anyone can hope to be on anything Coleridge intended to do. Mr McElderry is wise, I believe, in basing his views not upon the contingencies of Coleridge's disposition, but upon certain fairly clear lines of fictional development in what we have of the poem and in what we have of the plan. The nature of these lines, with their motivations for action and character, has been demonstrated recently by Mr Arthur H. Nethercot, who is able to bring Coleridge's demonic lore to bear upon the interpretation of this poem, the third in the magical triad.² But Mr Nethercot seems inclined to discount Dr Gillman's report, which does not, as he sees it, continue the demonic motif of the poem; for to his view 'the two parts might almost as well be separate stories'.³

In connexion with both these studies, I wish to suggest a slight change in Coleridge's plan which lay a long time in a mind not accustomed to the niceties of demonic lore. The good doctor reported:

The real lover returning, enters at this moment, and produces the ring which she had once given him in sign of her betrothment. Thus defeated, the supernatural being Geraldine disappears. As predicted, the castle bell tolls, the mother's voice is heard, and to the exceeding great joy of the parties, the rightful marriage takes place...⁴

The point here is the tolling of the bell. Mr Nethercot has sketched the conflict between forces of good and evil, a conflict in which *Christabel's* dead mother, her guardian spirit, is an agent of good. What he does not note, though it is a commonplace in the history of demonology, is that bells, especially church bells, are considered a force for good, because they are inimical to demons such as the false lady Geraldine.⁵ They oppose the

¹ 'Coleridge's Plan for Completing *Christabel*', *Stud. in Phil.*, xxxiii (1936), 437-55.

² *The Road to Trygermaine*, Chicago, 1939. Lowes said he did not treat *Christabel* because he could find no 'road' to it. Several years ago, like Mr Nethercot, I began to seek such a road, and I hope shortly to add some notes to his valuable study, especially with regard to the demonic background of *Christabel*.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 47.

⁴ James Gillman, *The Life of Samuel Taylor Coleridge* (London, 1838), p. 302.

⁵ It is enough to cite here, for example, Francesco Maria Guazzo, *Compendium Maleficarum*, trans. E. A. Ashwin (London, 1929), bk. iii, chap. iv. One may note, further, Professor Kittredge, *Witchcraft in Old and New England* (Cambridge, Mass., 1929), p. 158, and, for numerous citations, his notes, p. 476.

designs of our Adversary, who, hearing the sound of bells, 'breaks into the greatest indignation, exclaiming that he is balked of his purpose by the barking of those mad bitches'.¹

There are a good many references to bells in *Christabel*, and Coleridge, according to his method, intensifies the mood of his poem by bringing out their mysterious implications. They are, indeed, part of the fiction itself, for the Baron, constantly mourning his lost lady, has the bells toll daily for her, as the sacristan tells five and forty beads between the strokes. This is

a warning knell,
Which not a soul can choose but hear
From Bratha Head to Wyndermere.
Saith Bracy the bard, So let it knell!
And let the drowsy sacristan
Still count as slowly as he can!
There is no lack of such, I ween,
As well fill up the space between.
In Langdale Pike and Witch's Lair,
And Dungeon-ghyll so foully rent,
With ropes of rock and bells of air
Three sinful sextons' ghosts are pent,
Who all give back, one after t'other,
The death-note to their living brother;
And oft too, by the knell offended,
Just as their one! two! three! is ended,
The devil mocks the doleful tale
With a merry peal from Borodale.

(ll. 342-59)

Coleridge obviously knows the place of bells in demonology, and he has left us three notes on bells, written in 1808-9, one of which is especially suggestive. He notes:

For ringing the largest bell, as a Passing-bell, a high price was wont to be paid, because being heard afar it both kept the evil spirits at a greater distance, and gave the chance of the greater number of prayers *pro mortuo*, from the pious who heard it.²

This note is interesting as a commentary on the verses just quoted. Viewed against the larger demonic background of *Christabel*, it may also tenuously suggest that Dr Gillman, if he had listened and remembered better, would have heard Coleridge say that Geraldine, the loathsome lady, was to have disappeared *with* the tolling of the bell.

JOSEPH HORRELL.

CHAPEL HILL, NORTH CAROLINA.

¹ Nicolas Remy, *Demonolatriy*, trans. E. A. Ashwin (London, 1930), bk. 1, chap. xxvi.

² *Anima Poetae*, ed. Ernest Hartley Coleridge (London, 1895), p. 211. Mr Nethercot does mention Coleridge's curiosity about the method of ringing church bells in Germany as compared with England, expressed in a letter to his wife in 1899 (p. 156). But he passes over this note on bells, even though he cites the *Anima Poetae* in other connexions. It is interesting, too, that one of these connexions is a note, dated 1810, which E. H. Coleridge headed 'A Note for Christabel', but Mr Nethercot rejects it (pp. 144-5).

'PERRUN DE SARTAGNE' IN THE 'CHANSON DE ROLAND'

The line *Rollanz ferit el perrun de Sartaigne* (v. 2312 of the *Roland*) has given rise to many difficulties, both philological and literary, and called forth many different interpretations from editors of the text. Gaston Paris, among others, considers *Sartaigne* a word of uncertain origin and presumes it to mean a hard stone. Léon Gautier interprets the expression more precisely, as 'sardonix'. This latter suggestion probably arises from the *sardonie* of the Oxford MS., a form which is conceivably due to a confusion in the mind of the scribe: the text obviously refers to a stone; *sardonie* was well known to him and he substituted it for the original, which, in view of the assonance of the *larisse* concerned, is likely to have been *sardagne* or *sardaigue*.

The form *sardagne* would presumably represent a Latin *sardanium*, Sardinian (the adjective being used as a noun, a not uncommon practice), but the Latin adjective was *sardonius* or *sardonnus*, from the Greek *σαρδόνιος*, substituted by later authors for the Homeric *σαρδόνιος*, which adjective applied only to laughter. The single instance of the form *sardanium* cited by Ducange¹ is not sufficiently reliable evidence of the existence of this form in Latin. A French *sardagne* from *sardanium* must, therefore, remain suspect.

To account for the form *sardaigue* two etymologies have been suggested, the noun Sardinia and the Greek *σαρδόνιξ*.² As far as *Sardinia* is concerned, whilst the pronunciation stressing the *a* of the diphthong (as opposed to the levelled pronunciation) is not unknown in *Roland*,³ it would, however, involve further the passage to *ai* of the diphthong *ei* from *i*. In fact, the theory supposes that the levelled pronunciation of *ei* and *ai* had permitted a respelling of the word, but that at the same time the respelt form had reverted to the diphthongized pronunciation to provide an assonance in *a*.

The second suggestion comes from Léon Gautier,⁴ who prefers a form *sardenne* or *sardanie* (pronounced *sardanne*) deriving from *sardonicha* (for *sardonix*) through an intermediary form *sardanicha*. This would involve a popular development of a learned borrowing made direct from the Greek with no recorded intermediary. This history, lacking in evidence, is perhaps too complicated to be readily acceptable, although it does not

¹ *Sardanium*, in Gloss. Aelfrici (Forte *sardonium*).

² It is interesting to note that Isidore links Sardinia and the sardonix. This may be why we have always been led to assume that the etymology of *Sartaigne* must be connected with Sardinia.

³ M. K. Pope, 'A Clue to the Dialect of the *Chanson de Roland*?' *Mélanges Jeanroy*, Droz, 1928.

⁴ Léon Gautier, *Roland, texte critique and notes*, 2 vols., 1872.

lay itself open to objections on phonetic grounds. It does, none the less, raise the whole question of the meaning of the expression *perrun de Sartaigne*.

All these suggestions, unconsciously influenced by the *sardonne* of the Oxford MS., have assumed that the stone in question is the sardonix. If we accept this literally we may not unnaturally wonder how large boulders of sardonix came to be lying in a valley of the Pyrenees; we must obviously reject such an interpretation. Boissonnade¹ seeks to avoid the difficulty by ascribing to the expression the metaphorical sense of 'stone of the hardness of a *sartaigne*'. In the mediæval lapidaries, however, we find no suggestion that hardness or durability is an outstanding quality of the sardonix. If the writer of the *Chanson de Roland* wished to prove the strength of Durendal on 'une roche aussi dure que le diamant', as Boissonnade suggests, could he not have written without offending either assonance or sense, 'Rollanz ferit el perrun d'aimant'? Common sense would be no more outraged by a rock of diamond than by a rock of sardonix. It is surprising that Boissonnade who upholds the geographical accuracy of the text should have been content to interpret *sartaigne* as sardonix.

Let us consider the text for a moment. In each of the three *laisses* (vv. 2297-2354) we find the same sequence of details—Roland tries in vain to break Durendal on a rock, the rock splinters, Roland praises the sword for its marvellous qualities, boasts of the feats of arms he has performed with it, and swears that no pagan or unworthy hand shall possess it after him. Is it not possible that these details refer to one and the same incident and not to three separate attempts at breaking the sword, etc.? That this interpretation is eminently probable is shown by the fact that at this stage of the story we are told three times that Roland turned his head towards Spain and the enemy (vv. 2360, 2367, 2376), three times that he recited the *mea culpa* (vv. 2364, 2368-9, 2383) and three times that he made the feudal gesture of offering his glove to God (vv. 2365, 2373, 2389). These actions appear in the same sequence in three consecutive *laisses*. The striking of the stone with its attendant details would seem to be merely another case of this triple repetition and would refer to one incident only.²

¹ *Du nouveau sur la Chanson de Roland*, Champion, 1923.

² It is true that in line 2875 the author has referred to the three stones which Roland had struck, but here we seem to have the same confusion as is evident in the question of the pine or pines under which Roland lay (v. 2874, et. v. 2357): Gaston Paris has commented on the inconsistency of certain details at this stage of the story. If three separate incidents are referred to, it might be asked why, having tried to break his sword on three stones, Roland should not have made a further attempt upon the fourth (vide v. 2272).

We can thus equate *Pierre brune*, *perrun de sartaigne* and *Pierre bise*. Whatever the exact sense of *bise*, it seems generally accepted as a dark colour: *brune*, the most likely reading for line 2300, is consistent with this interpretation. It would seem, then, unlikely that the *perrun de Sartaigne* could be the sardonix. Further, Boissonnade¹ has proved the geographical accuracy of the descriptive detail in *Roland* with the exception of this unidentified stone.

It seems, therefore, that what we must look for is a dark stone which might be found in the district where Roland met his death, and one which would have struck him as suitable for his attempt at breaking his sword. All these requisites would be satisfied by the suggestion of granite for this stone.

Not only is it dark and brownish in colour, but by reason of the quartz and the mica in its composition might have suggested the poet's adjective *luisanz* (v. 2272). Further, the Pyrenees are largely composed of granite and gneisses so coarsely banded as to pass into granite. Boulders of this rock, then, would admirably suit the context. To explain the name used by the author for granite it should be remembered that Roland has just returned from the region of the Cerdagne (Cerritania), where granite outcrops are common, and where part of the story has been situated. What more natural than that the author, who obviously knew the Pyrenees, should have used 'rock of Cerdagne' to designate a boulder of granite? The form *Sardaigne* (*Sardagne*) could easily derive from Cerritania. If *Sartaigne* or *Sartagne* be accepted then we must explain the retention of the *t* by the influence of the word *terre* which one can assume frequently preceded it or by the recurrence of the Latin name in various documents.²

I. URWIN-DUDDRIDGE.

SHEFFIELD.

AMADAS ET YDOINE

A number of years ago John R. Reinhard published a meritorious analytical study on the Old French romance *Amadas et Ydoine*, in which he proposed to examine the various themes and motives of which it is composed and to trace each to its most probable fountain head.³ In doing this, he failed to take into account several parallels and analogues

¹ Op. cit.

² Cerritania is found many times in such documents from the ninth to the twelfth centuries. References to these are made by Boissonnade when dealing with the Cerdagne region on p. 113, n. 2.

³ John Revell Reinhard, *The Old French Romance of Amadas et Ydoine*, Durham, N.C., 1927.

of the story and overlooked altogether a study of ours on the same subject.¹ Quite naturally, the results reached by him, in spite of an imposing bibliography, are not as conclusive as they might have been.²

At the outset of his work Dr Reinhard quite properly examined the various occurrences of the names, borne by hero and heroine, in other medieval works of fiction and in medieval poetry. In this connexion he also mentioned the ballad *La belle Ydoine*, the work of Audefroï le Bastard, contemporary with *Amadas et Ydoine*.³ But on the next page he makes the somewhat startling statement that 'the romance *Amadas et Ydoine* bears no relation whatsoever to the documents cited above...'.⁴

Such a statement is quite indefensible, as will be seen from an outline of the ballad of Audefroï (we take for granted a general familiarity with *Amadas et Ydoine*):

The princess Ydoine is in love with the knight Garsile. On hearing of this, her father beats her black and blue and shuts her up in a tower where she is condemned to stay for three years. At the end of this period he abruptly orders her to marry a certain powerful lord who has asked for her hand. On Ydoine's refusal the king proclaims a tournament and promises to give her in marriage to the victor whoever he may be. Naturally, Garsile participates in the tournament, comes out victor, and obtains the prize, his beloved Ydoine....

Apart from the name of the heroine, the ballad will be seen to share the following features with *Amadas et Ydoine*: (1) the subject-matter is a love-romance; (2) the hero is (to use Professor Reinhard's terminology) a 'squire of low degree'; (3) the heroine, by her father's will, is to marry some other knight, her equal in rank; (4) the hero wins the hand of his beloved after a victory in a tournament.

Nor is this all. There is evidence to show that Audefroï no more invented the subject of his ballad than did the unknown author of *Amadas et Ydoine*: he appears merely to have worked up a conventional theme; for there exists a French ballad variously known as *La Fille du Roi Loys* or *Belle Isambourg*,⁵ which is clearly a parallel version of *La belle Ydoine* but contains in addition a characteristic episode of *Amadas et Ydoine*, the apparent death of the heroine and her rescue, in this condition, by her faithful lover. The action of the ballad is briefly as follows:

The daughter of King Louis avows to her father her love for the knight Déon, whereupon the king flies into a rage and has her shut up in a tower, where she is con-

¹ *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, xxv (1925), 313-21.

² Cf. the reviews of the book in *Romania*, lxxx (1927), 446 (Mario Roques); *Le Moyen Age*, xxxix (1929), 260-5 (M. Wilmotte).

³ A. Cullmann, *Die Lieder und Romanzen des Audefroï le Bastard*, Halle (1914), pp. 99-101.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 3.

⁵ G. Doncieux, *Le Romancéro populaire*, Paris (1904), pp. 71-83; M. Haupt, *Französische Volksheder*, Leipzig (1877), p. 92; F. J. Child, *The English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, II (4), 355 f.

demned to languish for seven long years. Finally he promises to set her free if she will change her mind; but she refuses obstinately to listen to his reasoning. Déon then sends her a secret message, advising her to feign death and to have herself buried at St Denis. She adopts this plan as the most likely to bring her near the fulfilment of her desire. As the funeral procession advances toward the abbey, Déon appears, stops it, cuts open the shrouds and sets her free, to kiss her and to marry her forthwith. In the end her father has to consent:

'Sonnez, trompettes et violons!
Ma fille aura le beau Déon.
Fillette qu'a envie d'aimer
Père ne l'en peut empêcher.'

To judge from the large number of variants, this ballad, which goes back to the sixteenth century,¹ seems to have been very popular in France. It even crossed the Channel, as is shown by its Scottish variants known under the title *The Gay Goshawk*.²

Doncieux, as unaware of the analogues as Professor Reinhard, assumed that the episode of the *fausse morte amoureuse* (as he called it) was foreign to the archetype and of Italian origin, and he referred to the well-known *novelle* of Masuccio Salernitano and Luigi da Porto, the story of Ginevra degli Almieri, and others. Yet the occurrence of the same motive in the romance *Amadas et Ydoine* and in the ballad can hardly be due to chance, and some connexion between the two is to be assumed. This conclusion is confirmed by the name of the ballad hero, *Déon*, which is evidently a form of endearment of *Amédée*.³ On the other hand, *Amédée* and *Amadas* both go back to *Amadeus*, just as *Clamadas*, *Clamedeus* to *Clamadeus*. Some relationship between the romance and the ballad would appear therefore rather likely. Since it contains the episode of the *fausse morte amoureuse* (which Audefrois's ballad lacks), the popular ballad seems to occupy an intermediary position between *Amadas et Ydoine* and *La belle Ydoine*.

The texts cited do not exhaust the number of stories composing this cycle, which may properly be called the *Cycle of Amadas et Ydoine* and of the existence of which Dr Reinhard was apparently unaware. Neither he nor his reviewers (so far as their critiques have come to our notice) appear to have seen the virtual identity of the entire first part of *Amadas et Ydoine* with the plot of the French romance of chivalry known under the title of *Paris et Vienne*, which dates from the middle of the fifteenth century.⁴ This work professes to be a translation from the Provençal, made by one Pierre de la Cypède, a citizen of Marseilles, in the year 1432.

¹ Doncieux, op. cit., p. 79; E. Blémond, *La Tradition*, II (1888), 133 ff.

² Child, op. et loc. cit., no. 96.

³ Cf. Bauche, *Le Langage populaire*, Paris (1920), p. 89.

⁴ Ed. R. Kalténbacher, 'Der altfranzösische Roman Paris et Vienne', in *Romanische Forschungen*, xv (1904), 321 ff.

The *editio princeps* saw the light at Antwerp in 1487. It certainly was one of the most popular novels of the period, counting eleven French editions and translations into Italian, Spanish, Catalan, English, Flemish, Swedish, Latin, and Armenian. Through the Italian translation it became the model of one of the most popular works of modern Greece, the *Erotokritos*, a poem by the Cretan Vincenzo Cornaro, composed about the middle of the sixteenth century.¹ The plot is briefly as follows:

Paris, the son of messire Jacques, a baron and liege of Godefroy de Lanson, the Dauphin of Vienne, is in love with Vienne, the daughter of his lord, and is loved by her in return. This meets with the emphatic disapproval of the Dauphin, who exiles the young man and forms a plan to marry his daughter to the son of the Duke of Burgundy. But she obstinately refuses to have anything to do with that suitor and does not allow him to see her when he arrives at her father's court. Exasperated at his daughter's behaviour, the Dauphin shuts her up in a dark prison. In the sequel the prose romance differs from the other texts of the cycle: the Dauphin is captured by the Saracens as he travels in the Orient with a view to collecting information for a crusade to be undertaken by the princes of Europe. He is freed by Paris who, like Amadas, has taken to travelling and has won the confidence of a Saracen prince. It goes without saying that in the end the Dauphin gives his consent to the marriage of the two young people.

It would seem reasonably certain that the three poems and the prose romance are ultimately derived from an archetype² which is likely to have contained the following incidents: (1) a young nobleman loves a lady who is the daughter of his liege-lord and therefore of higher rank, and is loved by her in return; (2) she declines to accept the hand of another suitor imposed upon her by the will of her father; (3) as a result she is thrown into prison but is freed in the end, either by a ruse (*fausse morte amoureuse*) or by the exertions of her lover, who comes out as victor in a tournament or renders to her father some signal service.

Amadas et Ydoine, which is by far the longest of the three poems which constitute the cycle, has a number of episodes which were probably absent from the archetype or, if present, were presumably much less developed. Among these are to be counted (to use once more Professor Reinhard's terminology) the *hoaxed husband*, the witch episode, the love madness, and the ring of death. As was pointed out elsewhere,³ these episodes are unnecessary for the main action of the poem and lead to internal contradictions, quite apart from the fact that several of them are of doubtful taste. They may therefore be ascribed to the compiler,

¹ N. Cartojan, 'Le modèle français de l'*Erotokritos*', in *Revue de littérature comparée*, xvi (1936), 265-93.

² It is unnecessary to add that the German editor of the romance, to judge from the section of his work devoted to an examination of its sources (p. 364), was likewise unaware of the existence of the *Cycle of Amadas et Ydoine*.

³ *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, xxv, 320.

who certainly cannot be classed among the most skilful representatives of his craft. The prose romance *Paris et Vienne* and a fortiori the Greek *Erotókritos* show a technique far superior and thus give eloquent testimony of the fact that their authors were modern men, nurtured in the traditions of the rising Humanism of a new age.

ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE.

PRINCETON, N.J.

REVIEWS

The Works of Michael Drayton. Vols. I-IV edited by J. WILLIAM HEBEL; Vol. V edited by J. WILLIAM HEBEL, KATHLEEN TILLOTSON and BERNARD H. NEWDIGATE. Oxford: Printed at the Shakespeare Head Press and published for the Press by Basil Blackwell. 1931-1941. Vol. I: 1931. xii + 507 pp.; Vol. II: 1932. xii + 588 pp.; Vol. III: 1932. viii + 439 pp.; Vol. IV: 1933. xii + 589 pp.; Vol. V: 1941. xxxii + 316 pp. £8. 18s. 6d.

Michael Drayton and his Circle. By BERNARD H. NEWDIGATE. Oxford: Printed at the Shakespeare Head Press and published for the Press by Basil Blackwell. 1941. xvi + 239 pp. 15s.

I am more disposed to write a suitable ode in celebration of the completion of this glorious edition of Drayton than to gird up my loins for a critical review of its achievement. There is ample scope for lyric treatment. Drayton would have known how to set about writing it.

The Drayton whom I knew most familiarly was clad in the shabby russet of Chalmers's *Poets*. Two hundred years ago Coffey's 1748 folio *Drayton* did honour to the poet, if not complete justice. He, who loved poetic decoration and display, now appears bravely caparisoned, swelling in royal blue, with everything handsome about him; for the first time, after three hundred years, with the full escort suitable for a poet who was in his day found worthy of burial in Westminster Abbey alongside Chaucer and Spenser. If his margins are a little stinted in the last volumes, and the pages crowded, it is impossible to complain, where all else is so generous, and economy in paper essential. Sir Walter Scott would have rejoiced. For Scott saw in Drayton one who had in him 'equal powers of poetry' with Spenser, a bold, blunt observation with which I for one cannot quarrel.

Never, again, has greater good-will gone to the just rehabilitation of a great English poet. I had known Professor Hebel as an agreeably severe bibliographer, and in other respects most agreeable and not severe, in my first contact with him on a visit to Cornell University. He was even then at work on Drayton, sedulous, undaunted, determined, a fine scholar on a great task. And he died, still a young man, the spade-work accomplished, for others to complete. The text of Drayton, contained in the first four volumes, in his work and his alone. And so is, in the main, the enormous collection of variant readings—the measure of his dauntlessness—of an author who was as critical of his own work as he was voluminous in his writing. Professor Hebel was in contact with two English scholars in especial, enthusiasts like himself, Mr Newdigate of the Shakespeare Head Press with its Elizabethan traditions derived from Bullen, and Miss Kathleen Constable, now Mrs Tillotson, who took over the work where Hebel left it. The inspiration all derived from Professor Oliver

Elton's illuminating study of Drayton, published in 1895 and 1905, can hardly be overestimated. Hebel had collected masses of notes bearing upon Drayton's life and associations, as well as his collations. The collations found their way into the fifth volume of the edition, which contains an admirably complete *apparatus criticus* of introductions, notes and variants, complementary to the four volumes of Hebel's text, together with a variety of useful *parerga*, an index to *Poly-Olbion*, a Bibliography of Drayton, a Glossary, and a General Index. In all of this, as in her precedent series of published papers on Drayton, Mrs Tillotson has shown herself to be a ripe and full Elizabethan scholar, of no less taste than learning. She was responsible for the valuable and learned Notes on the poems, except—no small exception—those on *Poly-Olbion*, which are the work of Mr Newdigate. The Bibliography, in the main Hebel's work, has been systematized and completed by the skill and knowledge of Mr Geoffrey Tillotson. The biography of Drayton was undertaken by Mr Newdigate, who proceeded to deal with it upon a novel plan, indicated by the title of the supplementary volume, *Drayton and his Circle*, which has now appeared and completes the whole great project, brought to a worthy conclusion.

Finally, great good-will went to the actual publication of this work of devoted and selfless scholarship. Hebel himself gave more than his labours towards it, and Mrs Hebel, after his death, continued his generosity. And the publisher, Mr Basil Blackwell, ensured that it should go to press, undeterred by financial considerations. The work does high honour to its printer-collaborator and its publisher alike, who have given Drayton good reason for withdrawing those strictures upon bookmakers and booksellers which he expressed in an ill-tempered letter to Drummond, and elsewhere. In 1931, when it commenced publication, the destroyer was on his way to power. A year before Hebel died Hitler was in the saddle. In 1939 came the war. But after two years of war the undertaking has been brought to a triumphant conclusion. My old Chalmers's *Drayton* has vanished in the London blitzes. In its place stands the new *Drayton*, in six handsome volumes. Good-will has overcome evil-will in this matter, as it will in all matters in due course. I find it impossible to doubt that the whole edition will, in fact, justify the wisdom as well as the enthusiasm of its originators. No self-respecting library can dispense with it, and every lover of English literature will desire to possess it. The whole work is lavishly illustrated, with facsimiles of title-pages and documents, and of maps in *Poly-Olbion*, with every known image of Drayton himself, and with pictures of places of especial interest to Drayton and therefore to us to-day.

Never was a more English poet than Drayton, whom Dr John Campbell, in 1741, described as 'poet and patriot'. And he could speak for England. Two famous lines in his *Ballad of Agincourt*,

Victor I will remaine,
Or on this Earth'lie slaine,

express the English spirit from *Maldon* down to the latest letter from Libya, yet in no mood of boastfulness or conscious heroism, as the rest of the stanza so amply shows. Hebel was a soldier, when the call came in the last war, and had the better right to take Drayton for his own. Drayton is full of the heroic spirit, and loved battles, in poetry at any rate. The epic, of one kind or another, is his real goal. He had his full share of this undauntable spirit himself. He could, like his editors, plan on a noble scale, and see it through. And to him there was nothing that poetry could not do. This may not be a fashionable view of the poetic art to-day, but it was an Elizabethan view. *Ex arduis aeternitas*, wrote one of his panegyrists.

Drayton was but little affected by the more cruel of the controversies of his time, much less than Spenser, for example. He does justice to the older England and is no informer upon 'superstition'. It is characteristic that in his first published work he seems ready to use any Bible for his purposes, according to the version, I suggest, that he found in the various houses of his sojourn when he was writing *The Harmonie of the Church*, at Collingham or at Polesworth. And he is one of the first of the true school of nature poets.

Thirdly, he has always been a 'Poet's Poet', not least strikingly among the Romantics, above all Wordsworth (to whom he passed on Chaucer's *Thopas* stanza), Keats and Tennyson.¹

Finally, justice has been done perhaps to his all-embracing poetic power, but not sufficiently to such especial gifts, among others, as his attack, his innumerable monumental lines and paragraphs, and his narrative skill.

It is not possible to do more, in present circumstances, than to accept with gratitude Professor Hebel's text, and, in any circumstances, to agree with the principles upon which it has been established, and the generous lines upon which the edition has been planned. Nothing is lacking to furnish full material for further study of the poet.

The printing of the book is admirable. One has to search for defects, e.g. in vol. v, dropped type on p. 15, note 5, or p. 57, middle of the page, in a very pernicky piece of setting. In the same volume, on p. 52, attention is called to errors in proof-reading in vol. i. 'It chanced sh' appears to have dropped out in *Poly-Olbion*, vol. iv, p. 547, l. 67. Altogether, Drayton, who was an exceptionally good proof-reader himself, *teste* Professor Hebel, would applaud this work done upon his poems.

I find minor inconsistencies in Mr Newdigate's volumes in the citations of documents, e.g. on pp. 33 and 35, where the same class of documents is referred to correctly as 'PRO C 24' but also as 'PRO 4 Jas. Chancery: Town Depositions'. In the same volume the transcription on p. 208 has several errors, including 'most' for 'muche'. I should be

¹ A valuable appendix to Mr Newdigate's life of Drayton is an article, 'Drayton's Literary Vogue since 1631', by Dr Russell Noyes, *Indiana University Studies*, communicated to me by Professor Elton. See also Professor Hebel's Preface to vol. iv, *Poly-Olbion*, pp. v-vi.

strongly inclined to accept the identification of Florio with 'Cerberon' (ibid. p. 69), with the view that a writer was involved, competing with Drayton for 'advancement'. In the many references to Scotland in this volume, I fail to find mention of the all-important reference in *Poly-Olbion* itself.

There is an interesting incident in the Aston sector of Drayton's circle, which I have long wished to narrate in full, a story which must have been well known to the poet and, I think, to Shakespeare too. Here, at any rate, is an outline in so far as it concerns our present subject.

Drayton's friend and patron Walter Aston had an elder sister Elizabeth, to whom her father Sir Edward Aston left £1000 for her portion when he died about June 1598. She became ward to her grandfather Sir Thomas Lucy, who took possession of her legacy when she went into residence under his charge at Charlecote, at the age of sixteen. In the same house with her was a young gentleman servant or page to Sir Thomas, John Sambach of Broadway, aged nineteen. Lucy soon saw danger in their relations, and sent Sambach away to serve Lord North. The sequel nevertheless was a midnight betrothal at Charlecote in Elizabeth's chamber. She was then spirited away by Lucy to Deane in Oxfordshire, to the house of Dr Martin Culpepper,¹ her 'brother-in-law' (whose family formerly owned Hartshill), whence she fled with Sambach, when out riding one morning, to Broadway. A marriage ceremony followed on 20 July 1600 at the house of Sambach's father there, conducted by William Crumps, Vicar of Didbrooke, Gloucestershire, a Star Chamber suit, and a considerable family born to the romantic pair at Broadway. Their second son, born in September 1602, was named Walter.

Lucy's own proposals for husbands for Elizabeth, it appears, were the son of Thomas 'Bewfoe' of Guy's Cliff, and one Mr Elton of 'Hasell' in Herefordshire. But the Astons, Elizabeth and Walter alike, seem to have preferred to decide for themselves in these matters.

It is clear that the sympathies of Lucy's household at Charlecote were with the young lovers, from his steward Miles Taylor to his chaplain and domestic 'schoolmaster' Bartholomew Griffin, and Elizabeth's maid Katherine Pedley. That Drayton would know the whole story cannot be doubted. That Shakespeare knew it can hardly be doubted. Sambach met his friends at 'The Bear' in Stratford, and among them were two of the Combes family. To one of these two Shakespeare bequeathed his sword. One may well wonder whether Lucy's 'schoolmaster' was the sonneteer of *Fidessa*, and whether he married Katherine Pedley in emulation of the superior romance they had abetted. Certainly the Bartholomew Griffin who died at Coventry in 1602 left a widow Katherine.

Is it not extraordinary, by the way, that there is no indication of Drayton's marrying? May we not relate this to our interpretation of his relations with his 'Idea'?

On p. 215 note 3, 'See p. 77' is surely an error. Can it be a confusion

¹ Apparently not related to the more famous Dr Nicholas Culpepper.

in indexing between 'Samuel Austin' and 'Austin Friars'? The reference should be to pp. 202-3. The note on *Piers Gaveston*, ll. 73-6, suggesting a reference to the 'School of Night', seems to me far-fetched. Machiavelli = Atheist was a commonplace equation.

Mrs Tillotson's Glossary in vol. v is a very valuable and necessary piece of work, which may open many eyes to the need for a closer study of Tudor and Stuart English. Is the form 'cornamute' for 'cornamuse' met with elsewhere? Or 'Antaricke'? Or are these really misprints? I find it difficult to accept 'leutter', on the other hand, as a likely misprint for 'leuterer', *Sir John Oldcastle*, l. 2222. One would have welcomed a note upon Drayton's language in general.

Perhaps such a study, and other studies, e.g. of the development of Drayton as a poet, may be in due course the outcome of this complete and definitive edition, for which we are immeasurably indebted to all concerned in so great and worthy an undertaking.

Securus judicat orbis terrarum.

True enough, but here is work that helps to ensure its ultimate truth, and leaves no excuse.

C. J. SISSON.

LONDON.

Divine Vengeance: A study in the Philosophical Backgrounds of the Revenge Motif as it appears in Shakespeare's Chronicle History Plays. By Sister MARY BONAVENTURE MROZ. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press. 1941. x + 168 pp.

The first seven chapters of this book give an account, as clear as could well be asked, of a subject for which the material is abundant, contradictory and widely scattered. The author traces the history, fluctuations and growth, up to the sixteenth century, of 'The Concept of Divine Vengeance' (chap. i), of the parts assigned to 'The Human Agent of Divine Vengeance' (chap. ii), the effects, moral, psychological and sociological, of the 'Abuse of Legal Justice' in the centuries immediately before the sixteenth (chap. iii), the special aspects of 'The Blood-Feud' (chap. iv) and 'Revenge for Tyranny' (chap. v), and finally traces the simultaneous, though less obvious, 'Reaction Against the Private Agent of Vengeance' (chap. vi). Her nice sense of theological, sociological and legal distinctions guides us through the history of the fluctuations of popular and ecclesiastical opinion on the nature of Divine vengeance and its relation to that executed by human agents, public or private. During the four centuries with which the book is mainly concerned, the theories involved (and to some extent the passions related to them) underwent those modifications which have made it notoriously difficult for modern readers to assess the resultant Elizabethan attitude, or, consequently, to agree upon the significance of the popular Elizabethan revenge play. Such investigations as those made in the present volume and in F. T. Bowers' recent *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy* serve to show how

inadequate is the approach through literature only, when there is question of the preoccupations and assumptions of another age or country.

The present author is less concerned than Dr Bowers with the drama which was one of the fruits of the Elizabethan discussion on this theme. Her main interests are with the origins of all this, tracing the changing opinions on the nature of law, and on the relations between Natural Law, *Lex Gentium* and Divine Law (modified successively by Stoic and Aristotelian exposition, by St Thomas Aquinas and Dante), until we reach the variations that are found in different parts of Europe in the sixteenth century.

This is no easy task and the author seems admirably qualified for it. We are predisposed to agree with her when she says (p. 1) that 'It is only logical to analyse the present problem in the light of the Thomistic philosophy, which permeated English thought in the periods examined in this investigation.'

It is when we reach the chapter on Shakespeare's plays, after this carefully collected and clearly classified evidence, that we feel some disappointment. In the first place, the author seems less at ease when drawing conclusions from the drama's more implicit modes of revelation than when she is balancing the facts and the explicit statements drawn from sociological and philosophical sources. The statistical method, valuable though it is, loses by its very inflexibility part of what it is trying to estimate—the reflexion in dramatic medium of certain complex and variable phases of thought. In the second place, there is something unsatisfactory in her selection of material at this point. All the English history plays in the First Folio are included on the plea that the question of authorship is 'outside the present investigation', since what is desired is 'dramatic evidence of the late sixteenth-century'. This—apart from some natural irritation at seeing all the parts of *Henry VI*, *John* and *Henry VIII* consistently referred to as 'Shakespeare's'—might pass. But the question then arises, why, in that case, take this group at all? Should we not have far better 'dramatic evidence of the late sixteenth century' if all genuine history plays written between 1590 and 1620 were included? We should then have the political thought of Peele (for what it is worth), of Greene, of Marlowe (which is worth a great deal) and of some of the Jacobean, as well as this somewhat heterogeneous group. If what is wanted is the corroboration lent by opinion reflected in drama, the author's category is much too narrow. If what is wanted is corroboration from Shakespeare's opinion, it is at once too narrow and too wide: too wide in that it includes very early, doubtful and partial plays (and that on an equal footing¹ with the five great plays of the central group

¹ The policy is, in fact, hardly equal; for, out of some 180 passages listed as significant in Appendix A, over 100 are taken from the five plays, 1, 2, 3 *H. VI*, *John*, *H. VIII*, and the remainder only from the five central plays in which his theory of state is built up. This represents the distribution of emphasis in the text also. Moreover, if 1 *H. VI* is to be treated seriously as evidence of Shakespeare's thought, at least as strong a plea can be entered for the far more interesting 'Hand D' fragments of *Sir Thomas More*.

in which Shakespeare's political belief is disclosed); too narrow in that it is surely unwise to assess Shakespeare's opinion on such a theme as, say, private revenge, without including the evidence at least of *Hamlet* and preferably of several plays from his Jacobean period. The title implies that this chapter is an integral part of the original scheme of the book, but these weaknesses give it the effect of an afterthought.

There is a long list of references to original sources (pp. 142-52) which should prove valuable to subsequent workers in this field.

UNA ELLIS-FERMOR.

LONDON.

The Twickenham Edition of the Poems of Alexander Pope. General Editor, JOHN BUTT. London: Methuen. Vol. iv. *Imitations of Horace with An Epistle to Dr Arbuthnot and The Epilogue to the Satires.* Edited by JOHN BUTT. 1939. liv + 406 pp. 16s. 6d. Vol. II. *The Rape of the Lock with Translations from Chaucer, The Temple of Fame, Elsie to Abelard, and The Elegy to the Memory of an Unfortunate Lady.* Edited by GEOFFREY TILLOTSON. 1940. xx + 410 pp. 16s.

It is probably in part owing to the war that the volumes of this new edition of Pope are not appearing in numerically consecutive order, and it may be long before we are able to consult the first volume, which is to contain the Pastoral Poetry and the *Essay on Criticism* and to be edited by Professor E. Audra of the University of Lille. There is, however, much to be said for the appearance first of the volume edited by Mr John Butt, who, as General Editor, explains the intentions of himself and his colleagues in a Preface before coming to his own essay introductory to vol. iv. The Twickenham Edition will, it is hoped, consist of six volumes which will comprise the complete poetical works of Pope, excluding the translations of Homer. That exclusion, we may hope, is only temporary; for, making all allowance for collaborators, if Pope's Homer is not Pope, what is it? Not, according to Bentley's reputed epigram, Homer. The intended first volume with the second will include most of the early poems collected in 1717; the third, to be edited by Mr Maynard Mack and Mr F. W. Bateson, 'all that was published of the great scheme of *Ethic Epistles*'; the fourth contains the *Imitations of Horace* and the two Horatian poems which go most suitably with them; the fifth, to be edited by Professor J. Sutherland, will include the two versions of *The Dunciad*; and the sixth, to be edited by Mr Norman Ault, the *Miscellaneous Poems*. This, it will be seen at once, is not the traditional arrangement, but it is reasonable as well as convenient for the practical considerations of size of volume and importance of content.

The text is that of the first edition of each poem, except where Pope himself revised it, when his revisions are followed. The textual notes record the readings rejected from such later authorised editions, but not MS. readings, which have been omitted with some regret, in view of

their interest for students of poetical origins, but still omitted because they were at an early stage rejected by Pope himself. Typographically and in punctuation the text follows the first editions, with certain recognized and defensible exceptions. The chief concern of the editors has been to provide a good text and enough critical material to enable the ordinary reader to understand what Pope is saying.

The means employed to that end may be studied in the two volumes now before us. Each considers the convenience of the reader by including a chronological table, a list of the principal poems to be found in other volumes, a list of abbreviations used, and an index. Each poem is prefaced by a full note on the text, and most poems by a key to the critical apparatus. Mr Tillotson gives a full and documented introduction to the Translations from Chaucer, *The Rape of the Lock* (of which the two versions are rightly printed separately), and the other poems in his volume, and Mr Butt to the Imitations of Horace; and each volume also contains additional matter. Vol. II has a series of Appendices (or Appendixes, which seems to be the form preferred by Mr Tillotson), full of relevant information; and vol. IV has a Biographical Appendix which is intended 'to relieve the footnotes of certain subsidiary annotations, and in particular of all biographical information concerning Pope's contemporaries', of many of whom no other account is believed to exist.

And this brings us to one of the outstanding merits of this edition. It is intended primarily for the ordinary intelligent reader, but for the more serious student as well the critical notes, including most of the elucidatory matter, will be found of great value in enlarging the understanding both of Pope's meaning in any specific passage and of the subtleties of his art. Mr Butt refers to the help given by Pope himself and his contemporaries in noting echoes and explaining allusions, to the annotations of editors from Warburton to Elwin and Courthorpe, and to later discoveries of new material, and explains the intentions of the present editors 'to select all that is valuable from the work of their predecessors, and to add to it the discoveries which they themselves have made.' In other words, or less modestly expressed, there is a great deal of first-hand research here, far more than will probably be recognized by most of those who are indebted to it. Though the volumes are pleasant enough in appearance not to frighten the common reader, the student is likely to find himself learning something from most of their pages. It is to be hoped that all the evils of war will not cause more than a temporary slowing-down of the labours of the other editors, and, once more, that one of them or a colleague will presently undertake an edition of the *Homér*.

LONDON.

EDITH C. BATHO.

The Prose Style of Samuel Johnson. By W. K. WIMSATT, JR. (*Yale Studies in English*, 94.) London: Humphrey Milford. 1941. xvi + 166 pp. 18s. 6d.

The distinguishing characteristic of Mr Wimsatt's study of the prose style of Samuel Johnson is that he consistently analyses his subject's rhetoric as a medium of expression. Statistics are available on the occurrence of parallelism and antithesis in Johnson, and on the 'Latin' and 'philosophic' element in his diction; indeed, Mr Wimsatt remarks that he has done a good deal of counting himself; but a bare estimate of the frequency of a particular 'device' in Johnson's prose tells us little about the mode of thought which this frequency implies. It is the meaning that Mr Wimsatt scrutinizes. Accepting the modern doctrine of the identity of style and meaning, he sets out to interpret in accordance with this doctrine the apparently recalcitrant 'figures of speech' which Johnson inherited from ancient rhetoric. This interesting and fruitful attitude necessitates going behind Johnson's own utterances on style, for Johnson was an 'ornamentalist', who wrote and spoke about adorning the truth and recommending topics by the superaddition of elegance and imagery. Mr Wimsatt, however, speculates whether any great writer was ever an ornamentalist in more than terminology:

When Johnson speaks of things and their ornamentation, we should have no difficulty in recognizing that he is talking about things and aspects of, or ideas about, things. That is all he can be talking about. Both the things and the ideas about them are included in what we call meaning. Since Johnson was not concerned with our particular problems, he was content to look on things, truths, or facts, as solid 'meaning' (though he did not employ the term) and on notional modulations as 'ornament'. We need not then quarrel with his theory while describing it, but must recognize what it means in our own terms.

In the same way, he restates the objections that have been made against Johnson's prose. His unidiomatic inversions, for instance, particularly of nouns in oblique cases, are intrinsically expressive, because they are means of securing continuity, and therefore a part of his inclination to logic; but 'the mastery of a language consists in accommodating the needs of intrinsic formal expressiveness to the limitations of idiom', and where, as here, a form of expressiveness is imported from Latin which is not available in English, the gain in coherence 'is more than offset by the intrusion of irrelevant meaning which is concomitant with the unidiomatic'.

From the standpoint of meaning Mr Wimsatt scrutinizes the familiar features of Johnson's style, and makes fresh distinctions in them. His parallelisms are rather those of emphasis than of range, and his frequent antitheses are to be connected with his preference for abstract diction, since 'not things but aspects of them can be contrasted in words'. Words themselves must be considered in their context, as the same word may be learned or ordinary language, according as it is used. Interesting points are the description of Johnson's 'dryly non-sensory' imagery;

the tracing of much of his special 'philosophic' diction to his scientific reading, and of his arrangement of words to the rhetoric of the neo-classic couplet; and the attempted interpretation of his own scattered comments on style, together with a penetrating light on the cause of his inveterate dislike of Swift.

This is a closely-reasoned, stimulating book, treating an old subject from an original angle, and reclaiming neglected or discredited rhetorical schemes for the general study of prose style. A contemporary of Johnson might have remarked with approbation that at times the solid virtues of Mr Wimsatt's scholarship are embellished by a quiet wit; we, better instructed, rejoice that his total meaning includes these pleasant notional modulations.

J. M. S. TOMPKINS.

ENGLEFIELD GREEN, SURREY.

A Bibliography of the Works of Edward Gibbon. By J. E. NORTON.
London: Oxford University Press. 1940. xvi + 256 pp. 21s.

The list of Gibbon's published works is short, nor were the circumstances of their publication obscure or troublesome. To that extent his bibliographer has a straightforward and measurable task. Yet, as Miss Norton says, 'the detailed collation of twelve-volume editions is a tedious process', and there were enough contemporary and early editions of the *Decline and Fall* to make her book a substantial and valuable contribution to bibliographical studies and to our knowledge of the publishing and literary history of the last quarter of the eighteenth century and the first quarter of the nineteenth. All editions of Gibbon's works, in this country or abroad, in English or in translation, before the lapse of copyright (in the case of the major work this was in 1795-1804) are collated in full, and every important or interesting edition till 1838, when the appearance of the first volumes of Milman's critical edition brings Miss Norton's labours to an end. Her examination has been most painstaking, several unrecorded editions and unsuspected cancels have rewarded her researches, and the value of her formal collations of perfect, or least-imperfect copies, is increased by notes and appendices on the peculiarities of certain sets and volumes. Finally, there is a chronological list of attacks on Gibbon which adds a few titles to those discussed so conscientiously by Mr McCloy in *Gibbon's Antagonism to Christianity* (1931). Here, under '1780 Hayley, William,' might be added the Dublin edition of *An Essay on History* (1781).

Rather more than half the volume is given to introductory essays which are designed to set the specifically bibliographical information against a literary, social, and personal background. Taken together (they can quite well be read consecutively) these form a singularly pleasant exercise in biography, with Gibbon the author-as Gibbon the man. They are well documented from contemporary opinion, especially from the

reviews, and make competent use of all known material for the period after the publication of the *Essai sur l'Étude de la Littérature* in 1761. They extend the interest and enhance the appeal of a well-proportioned piece of research work, and will be read with pleasure by the many students of Gibbon whose bent is not primarily bibliographical.

GWYN JONES.

ABERYSTWYTH.

John Sterling, A Representative Victorian. By ANNE KIMBALL TUELL. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1941. xii + 405 pp. \$3.50.

Anyone wishing to recall the *Sturm und Drang* of the nineteen-thirties and forties is advised to read this book. For Sterling was one of those eager, 'electric' souls who must be at the centre of the struggle, social, political, and religious, of his day. The price paid, as often happens, is infinite vexation and, in his case, an ultimate sense of defeat. And yet we seem to hear at the close the comfortable words of another minor protagonist in these events, 'Say not the struggle naught availeth'.

The titles of Miss Tuell's chapters sufficiently indicate the feuds into which Sterling hurled himself with reckless disregard for health or peace of mind. First there is, from Cambridge days, the Radical crusade (he was a shining light among the Cambridge 'Apostles'), leading naturally enough, where generous youth is concerned, to the astonishing Spanish adventure of 1830 in which our Galahad and F. D. Maurice and friends were engaged not merely as financial backers of revolution in the Peninsula but as actual conspirators. What a pity it would have been if the youthful Tennyson had not been stirred to participation in the same adventure, before he settled down to the long hours of the Victorian afternoon! Then another crusade, as a planter in the West Indies, on behalf of negro education, was necessary to persuade Sterling that active reform was not his forte. But there still remained the dozen or so measures required at home to realize England's green and pleasant land—free trade, Catholic Emancipation, Ireland; see the list in any child's manual of English history—and into these Sterling threw himself with ardour. Then the great shadow falls on his too brief page. He is caught up in the religious controversies of the day, even as Newman, and Pusey, and Carlyle, and F. D. Maurice, and all the rest of that period were. Juhus Hare's curate at Hurstmonceux was in two brief years jostled to the ropes as a young man who could not keep his feet in those terrible years when Strauss's *Leben Jesu* was taking the heart out of religious youth. For of course Sterling, like Arnold a little later, would be all for German enlightenment, and not merely as it affected the higher criticism.

Such quixotry is out of fashion to-day. We have been taught to tilt at one abuse and stick to it. But it is good for our souls to contemplate the mortal strife of those high-souled Englishmen who engaged in the

condition-of-England question in early Victorian times. Sterling is not perhaps one of the great ones in the field, but his enthusiastic presence in every part of the field makes his life extraordinarily interesting to those whose business or pleasure it is to visualize those times. The fact that there are two *Lives* already, those by Julius Hare and by Carlyle, not to speak of numerous collections of letters and extended references elsewhere, shows that the present study is not uncalled for. The highest praise one can give Miss Tuell's work is to say that she has brought all the old material together and reinforced it by a considerable store of new letters, and that she has been able, partly from the lapse of time and the cooling of fires, to deal justly and gently with the controversialists. Of one thing only would I be inclined to complain, that in following out her various themes she has sacrificed something of the clearness of biography. The chapters overlap chronologically, sometimes, I feel, a little disconcertingly. But that was no doubt difficult to avoid on her plan. Her style, while not free from occasional lapses, indicates complete understanding of the matters of which she treats.

GEORGE KITCHIN.

EDINBURGH.

Browning's 'Roman Murder Story' as recorded in a hitherto unknown Italian contemporary Manuscript. Translated by E. H. YARRILL, with an introduction by WILLIAM O. RAYMOND.

Baylor's Old Yellow Manuscripts, containing the Conversation of Marquis Francesco Azzolini with Gio. Lodovico Francia, translated by J. E. SHAW, and the Ill-fated Good Fortune of Francesco Canonici, called Mascambruni, translated by BEATRICE CORRIGAN. (*The Baylor Bulletin*, Baylor University, Waco, Texas, vol. XLII, no. 4 and vol. XLIV, no. 3. 47 and 99 pp.)

Baylor University, Waco, Texas, is issuing a series of 'Browning Interests', based on its very large Browning collection, and the latest numbers provide us with a hitherto unknown contemporary account of the Franceschini murder-case, which yielded the material for *The Ring and the Book*. The manuscript, a lively popular account, bound up with two other pamphlets, was bought by Professor A. J. Armstrong of Baylor, under the impression that it was the Secondary Source sent to Browning by Mrs Baker from Florence in 1862. Its independent nature, however, has been established by Professor William O. Raymond of Bishop's University, Canada, who has written an introduction to Mr E. H. Yarrill's translation of the text, in which he points out both its close relation to the Secondary Source and its noteworthy divergences and additions. As Browning did not know this version, its interest is rather historical than literary. One can learn from it the true age of Guido Franceschini, who was ten years younger than Browning, relying on the Secondary Source, made him, and some dramatic details about the murder and the capture

and execution of the murderers, which Browning might have used, had he known them. The deeper interest that would attach to any account that helped us to judge of Browning's claim that his reconstruction was essentially true, is not forthcoming. The English version has an ungainliness that is probably the result of close literal translation. No specimen of the original Italian is provided.

The two other manuscript pamphlets, a brief satirical dialogue between a dying rascal and his equally rascally confessor, translated by Professor J. E. Shaw of Toronto, and a well-written account of the career and death of the upstart cleric Francesco Canonici, called Mascambruni, in the papacy of Innocent X, translated by Dr Beatrice Corrigan, have no direct bearing on Browning's poem, but illustrate certain corrupt aspects of the life of Papal Rome in the second half of the eighteenth century. Searching in Mazzatinti's *Inventari delle Biblioteche d'Italia* for indications of other manuscript accounts of Mascambruni, Dr Corrigan also found references to four more manuscripts dealing with the Franceschini case, that are apparently not yet known to the students of Browning. They are in Italy, and await inspection at a more genial time.

J. M. S. TOMPKINS.

ENGLEFIELD GREEN, SURREY.

Essays in Criticism and Research. By GEOFFREY TILLOTSON. Cambridge: University Press. 1942. xxix + 215 pp. 15s.

Mr Tillotson's book is an assemblage of articles and reviews and it suffers from the inevitable defects of its kind; it lacks unity and its contents are of unequal merit and interest. The external form provided by the publisher and printer is especially delightful: we cannot hope, in these days of paper shortage, for many more books so pleasant to see and to handle, but a correspondingly satisfying internal form is necessarily lacking. The only unity is that of the personality of the critic. A few of the essays seem too brief and unimportant to warrant their reappearance in book form; but a majority are well worth preserving.

The book opens with a preface, longer than any of the subsequent essays, setting out the writer's conception of 'the function of criticism at the present time'. The views therein expressed are admirable and timely. In particular Mr Tillotson emphasizes the critic's duty to reinterpret a poem in the light of his knowledge of the period in which it was written. He must learn to read into the poet's words the meanings they had for him and for his contemporaries, losing sight neither of the limited and precise meaning which may have been obscured by subsequent accretions, nor of any associations the words may once have had and of which an unlearned modern reader would be unaware:

The original meaning of a word in a great poem is the only one worth attending to. However delightful the meaning arising out of new verbal connotations, such meaning

is irrelevant to the author's poem... If it is not fair to hold him responsible for the degradation of *blooming*, he should not be accredited with incidental gains which may have befallen other words of his.

This is the principle whereby Mr Tillotson would pilot the critic between the Scylla of an ignorant simplicity and the Charybdis of an Empsonian oversubtlety.

The subjects of the essays cover a wide range of time, from Henryson to Housman, and they vary in kind and scale from casual causerie to careful and scrupulous revaluation. The most illuminating are those on Lyly's prose comedies, on eighteenth-century diction, on Pope, and on William Morris. All of these show the author's special interest in technique. The same critical eye discerns the Ovidian influence on the nice pattern of Lyly's post-euphuistic sentence structure, and observes the fatal consequences of Morris' indifference to the discipline of art. The essays on Pope include some of the material already available in Mr Tillotson's book, but they add much that is of value. By means of an excellent piece of analysis Mr Tillotson points out the rewards that Pope's poetry offers to a reader who has 'a head full of earlier poetry and prose', but he is also aware of those qualities in Pope's poetry which are available for less learned readers. At last, however, Mr Tillotson's justifiable enthusiasm for his subject carries him beyond the bounds of reason when he tells us that

Pope's words pay us their sense down, generously and with a variety of com; but when we look up into the face of the giver we see it as a face enskyed and sainted.

We shall not read Pope more intelligently if we think of him as an Augustan Isabella. Similarly exaggerated is an enthusiasm for Gray which claims that his poetry is well described in Wordsworth's sentence: 'Poetry is the breath and finer spirit of all knowledge; it is the impassioned expression which is in the countenance of all science.'

But these excesses do not invalidate the more careful criticism contained in the essays. Predominantly these are the product of a mind well furnished with classical and English literature and applied with discriminating care to particular works which reward a scholarly scrutiny.

JOAN BENNETT.

CAMBRIDGE.

Poetry and Prophecy. By N. KERSHAW CHADWICK. Cambridge: University Press. 1942. xvi + 110 pp. 7s. 6d.

The purpose of this little book, as the author declares in her preface, is to stimulate interest in the culture and thought of unlettered and backward peoples, which she believes to have been ultimately derived from the great centres of civilization and to provide no basis for speculations about so-called 'primitive' man. The book is small, but it is full of wide and specialized learning, and the present reviewer must admit that he is only competent to treat of it as a contribution to the understanding

of the nature of poetry in general. His predominant feeling is one of gratitude, but if, as he supposes, the book is chiefly intended for the common reader, he suspects that that reader may wish that there had been less detail and more insistence upon what Johnson called 'large appearances', and that he may often be distracted by a multitude of facts which he is unable to correlate.

There are two main themes: the behaviour and characteristics of the poet, prophet, or seer (they are, it would seem, indistinguishable), and his message.

The seer does not regard his message as *his*; the widely held modern conception of poetry as, primarily, 'self-expression' is as foreign to the peoples whose oral literature Mrs Chadwick has studied as it was to the Greeks.

At the moment when the divine spirit enters the seer in response to his summons, when the spirit actually 'possesses' the seer, he ceases, in his own opinion and that of his auditors, to speak from his own intellect, or by his own art, and speaks as another (p. 62).

She perceives an analogy between the 'stimulants' which put the Tatar shaman into a condition of mental exaltation, 'so that he is at concert pitch, in a more elevated frame of mind than his fellows', and the training in the contemplative life given by various monastic orders; others, perhaps, will find here a justification of more commonplace 'stimulants', and will recall those lines from *The Shepherds Calender* which Ben Jonson loved to quote:

Who ever casts to compasse weightye prise,
And thinkes to throwe out thondring words of threate,
Let powre in lavish cups and thriftie bitts of meate,
For Bacchus fruite is frend to Phoebus wise;
And, when with Wine the braine begins to sweate,
The numbers flowe as fast as spring doth ryse.

The seer's 'message' is closely related to his priestly and mediatorial function; he believes, and his audience believes, that, when he passes into the condition of trance, he establishes contact with the world of spirits, and becomes a kind of Orpheus, relating the world of the living to the world of the dead. 'He alone can convoy the spirit of the dead to the living, and he alone can convoy the living in safety to their last abode among the dead. He alone can bring knowledge from the gods and from the spirits of the underworld' (p. 57). And Mrs Chadwick insists that, while European literature has been mainly concerned with man's physical and material life, that of Asia, Polynesia, and Africa has been mainly concerned with what she calls his 'spiritual journeys', which turn out to be mainly quests for personal immortality. 'This quest of immortality, the effort of men and women to master matter by spirit, is the chief intellectual preoccupation of men and women outside the sphere of civilization to-day' (p. 94). Here, if conclusions are to be drawn and judgements of value to be pronounced, certain important distinctions

must be made. That death is, as Rilke, the most 'Orphic' of modern poets, declared, the unilluminated side of life, that it should modify all our views about man's place and function in the world, and that we should try to conceive of and live in a *whole* which includes both life and death, past and present, may perhaps be regarded as a truth which the Western world has too much neglected. One may, indeed, imagine how Rilke, who professed to have perceived glimmerings of this truth even in the Egyptian cult of the dead, would have been kindled by the description of the perpetual courts of the dead kings of Uganda, each of whom was hereditarily represented by the *mandwas* or seers of a particular clan, whose task it was to transmit orally and mimetically his characteristics at the time of his death. Nevertheless, it seems necessary to deny what the reviewer, perhaps erroneously, understands the author to affirm, that there is anything essentially 'spiritual' about spiritualism, or that an exclusive preoccupation with personal immortality is more 'spiritual', and therefore more admirable, than the characteristic preoccupations of European man. Nowhere was such a preoccupation more intense than among those rock-tomb-hewing and pyramid-building rulers of ancient Egypt, who, it has been plausibly asserted, first introduced into the world the blessing of large-scale warfare.

J. B. LEISHMAN.

SOUTHAMPTON.

Vowel Sounds in Poetry: Their Music and Tone Colour. By M. M. MACDERMOTT. (*Psyche Monographs* No. 13.) London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner. 1940. 148 pp. 5s.

Led on from a more general investigation into the music of poetry to a special study of the part played in it by vowels, the most sonorous type of speech sounds, Miss Macdermott made an arithmetical estimate of the 'strength' of each of the vowels in a large number of poems. The results of this analysis suggested that in most poems, or in units within poems, either front or back vowels were dominant, and that the two types, associated with different emotions and ideas, gave different tone colour to the verse. Thus it appeared that the dominance of front vowels was associated with, for example, upward motion; freshness of youth, morning, or spring; wailing and lamentation; while the dominance of back vowels was associated with downward motion; fulfilment of age or evening; moaning. It was found that many bad poems failed to show a satisfactory dominance, and that many more had exaggerated or wrong tone colour.

Certain anomalies, however, presented themselves. Thus the front vowel in *hat* was found on occasion to dominate among back vowels, and this and a desire for an explanation of the facts led to an inquiry into the physical nature of vowels. Miss Macdermott is not herself a physicist, and she gives an account of her appeal to the work of Miller, Ogden,

Paget, and others. The subject is one of considerable complexity, and the last word on it has not yet been said, but her conclusions may perhaps be briefly indicated as follows. Each vowel has two characteristic bands of resonance concerned in its production, front vowels being associated with higher frequencies, back vowels with lower. Now the vowels of *hat*, *bud*, *earth*, *the* (unstressed), and the starting point of *I*, fall in the middle of the pitch series formed by the vowels, and the bands of each are so disposed that Miss Macdermott considers that they may form part of a dominant group of either front or back vowels. She calls them 'common vowels' and includes them with the dominant group in the final calculations. Another apparent anomaly lay in the fact that, in certain units, instead of a dominance of either front or back vowels, there was dominance by a group made up of the front vowels of *heat* and *hut* and the back vowels of *good* and *food*. The main resonances of the back vowels fall within a low band of frequencies, those of the front vowels within a high band; but it was now found that the vowels of *heat* and *hut* (and certain others) had also each a band of resonance overlapping those of *good* and *food*. It was concluded that there is a harmonic relation between the vowels of this group, and that this underlies the pleasure in their association. When these vowels are dominant, they are referred to as the deep group, which is regarded as a lower variety of the low.

The theory is interesting. The importance to be attributed to it, however, must depend very largely on the answer to the question whether the dominance of a particular group of vowels is in fact significantly pleasurable apart from the words and phrases in which the sounds actually occur. This is by no means certainly the case; the pleasure may have an essentially linguistic source. What is called the beautiful sound of words is often observably a matter of association of ideas, and Miss Macdermott's preliminary hesitation in the grouping of certain vowels goes, perhaps, to show that the matter is not entirely one of ear in this case.

It will be noted that the figure expressing dominance gives only a comparison of the relative strengths of different types of vowels, and ignores the position of individual vowels in relation to one another, though this might well be important. It is probable, too, that Miss Macdermott underrates the importance of normal intonation, and not everyone will agree that 'in verse speaking the conventional intonations of ordinary speech disappear'. What precisely is to be understood by 'conventional' is not certain, but it seems clear that normal intonation can give much more subtle and efficient aid in conveying meaning than tone colour with its two, or at most three, crude shades. The average strength of the common vowels in the eleven passages fully analysed in the text is just over 31% of the total, so that a passage must often, if not usually, be analysed before the tone colour can be stated with certainty. It does not seem to have been convincingly proved that the common vowels can range themselves entirely with the dominant group, and if they are no

more than neutral, the effective dominance must in any case be seriously reduced.

N. C. SCOTT.

LONDON.

The Works of Guillaume de Salluste, sieur Du Bartas. A critical Edition with Introduction, Commentary, and Variants in three volumes By URBAN TIGNER HOLMES, Jr., JOHN CORIDEN LYONS, and ROBERT WHITE LINKER. Vol. III. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1941. viii+576 pp. 30s.

Nous avons déjà eu le plaisir de rendre compte ici même¹ des deux premiers volumes de cet ouvrage; avec le troisième, que nous avons maintenant sous les yeux, s'achève la publication des œuvres complètes de Du Bartas. Ce troisième volume est très riche de matière: il nous donne les 14,000 vers environ de la *Seconde Sepmaine*,² suivie de quelques poèmes de moindre importance, d'un appendice sur l'influence et la popularité de Du Bartas en Grande-Bretagne et en Amérique,³ d'un glossaire et d'une bibliographie.

C'est un lieu commun que de dire que Du Bartas est un poète inégal; nulle part dans son œuvre ce défaut ne se montre plus clairement que dans la *Seconde Sepmaine*. Le poète est inégal de toutes les manières possibles: tout d'abord, il est inégal à lui-même; sans raison apparente, à des vers magnifiques en succèdent d'autres si mauvais, tellement ridicules et cacophoniques qu'on ne sait vraiment comment on pourrait les qualifier; le poète lui-même est conscient de ce défaut et il déplore que ses vers soient

...tantost animez d'une divine ardeur
Et tantost frissonnants d'une indocte froideur⁴

ce qui est peu dire.

Et encore:

Pour lier mes discours bien souvent l'entremets
Des vers lasches, clochans, rudes et mal-limez.⁵

Parfois, à côté de passages d'un style sobre et nerveux, à côté de vers frappés en médailles, on est confondu de le trouver subitement filandreux, ampoulé, confus, rocailleux, ou de le voir s'abaisser à des procédés puérils d'harmonie imitative.

Surtout il est trop souvent inégal à son sujet; quand le lecteur se prépare à entendre avec recueillement le jeu des grandes orgues qu'exigeait

¹ *M.L.R.* xxxii (1937), p. 108; et xxxiv (1939), p. 274.

² Incomplète du reste; Du Bartas n'a pu rédiger que quatre jours, formés de dix-sept épisodes, qui vont depuis l'histoire du Paradis Terrestre jusqu'à la prise de Jérusalem par Nabuchodonosor.

³ Cet appendice complète l'étude sur l'influence de Du Bartas, étude qui se lit au premier volume. Nous adressons nos remerciements tout particuliers aux éditeurs d'avoir bien voulu tenir compte du desideratum que nous avions formulé.

⁴ *Furies*, 395.

⁵ *Magnif.* 37.

son thème—l'Éden, le Déluge, Salomon—il est péniblement surpris d'avoir à écouter le grincement du crin-crin d'un baladin de foire. Son mauvais goût est incroyable: dans les *Colonies*, il fait un catalogue de noms géographiques presque incompréhensible et digne de Rabelais.¹ Ailleurs son énumération des maladies qui s'abattent sur l'humanité, quoique par endroits saisissante, se déroule interminable sur un mode qui rivalise d'élégance avec le style de M. Purgon ou celui de Thomas Diafoirus. Il écrit sans sourciller des vers comme celui-ci:

De ses vents prisonniers la colique les gême.²

Il peut devenir à la fois grotesque et horrible, comme dans le long discours d'une mère qui, affamée, a mangé la chair de son enfant et dénonce sa voisine parce qu'elle refuse de partager son fils à elle,³ ou simplement répugnant.

Et cependant combien de magnifiques parties d'un poète de race, combien de nobles envolées retrouvons-nous pas dans cette *Sepmaine*! Du Bartas excelle dans les tableaux réalistes, admirablement vus et notés d'un trait bref et sûr, la description d'un voleur,⁴ le jugement de Salomon;⁵ d'autres passages sont tout vibrants d'émotion profonde et contenue;⁶ d'autres respirent l'amour de la nature, animée ou inanimée;⁷ d'autres l'amour de Dieu et de la religion.

Il ne manie pas moins heureusement les idées et nous suggère tantôt Bodin, tantôt La Boétie.⁸ A ce point de vue, sa poésie scientifique, malgré les défauts, trop souvent visibles ici, que nous avons signalés plus haut, est étonnante d'aisance et de clarté; il accomplit fréquemment de véritables tours de force, comme dans sa description de l'astrolabe.⁹

Et partout sa verve est débordante, incroyable; elle est souvent vulgaire, son génie—comme celui de tant d'autres poètes français—l'entraîne vers le réalisme; de sorte qu'elle manque de raffinement et même, malgré l'ardeur de sa foi religieuse, de spiritualité: cependant elle cesse rarement d'étonner le lecteur et de le tenir en haleine. Rebuté trop souvent par le mauvais goût, la prolixité, la cacophonie, on a peine, emporté qu'on est par le torrent de cette verve, à interrompre sa lecture.

De la *Première Sepmaine* la *Seconde Sepmaine* a conservé le caractère essentiel: elle est une encyclopédie, une *Somme* plutôt, où grouille toute la science du xvi^e siècle. Et on sait combien cette science est mélangée: on y trouve de tout, légendes, fables antiques où la mythologie a plus de part que l'observation, prodiges, préjugés, superstitions populaires, tout cela coule mélangé au récit biblique. On comprend combien la tâche des éditeurs a dû être laborieuse et difficile; il est tout à leur honneur qu'ils ne s'y soient jamais montrés inférieurs; avec autant de perspicacité que de patience et de science, ils ont su démêler l'origine de

¹ V. Hugo n'est-il pas tombé fréquemment dans le même défaut?

² *Furies* 413; *les* = les intestins.

³ *Impost.* 91 et surtout 317.

⁴ *Impost.* 601; *Artif.* 1; *Colon.* 702, etc.

⁵ *Capit.* 899, 961, 1013.

⁶ *Schisme* 673-752.

⁷ *Magnif.* 421.

⁸ *Babyl.* 197, *Artif.* 369, 451, etc.

⁹ *Colonn.* 601.

tous ces apports et l'expliquer en des notes claires et brèves qui éclairent le lecteur sans lui cacher l'œuvre. Ils peuvent se féliciter, comme nous les félicitons, d'avoir fait de bon travail; grâce à eux, nous possédons enfin une édition définitive d'un vieux poète longtemps méconnu, leur ardu labeur a produit non seulement un ouvrage capital pour l'étude de la Renaissance littéraire en France, mais un véritable monument qui fait grand honneur à l'érudition américaine et plus particulièrement à l'enthousiasme, au zèle et à la persévérance des savants éditeurs.¹

F. J. TANQUEREY.

LONDON.

Montaigne in France, 1812-52. By D. M. FRAME. New York: Columbia University Press; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1940. 308 pp. 20s.

This is a diligent compilation of the opinions expressed about Montaigne in France in the first half of the nineteenth century. The attitude of French writers to Montaigne's personality, ideas and style forms the three main divisions of the book. References are given and are supported by a sixty-page bibliography which establishes the contention of Mr Frame's final words, that this period 'witnessed the acceptance of the complete Montaigne as a French literary classic' (p. 231).

Many of the authors quoted are either unknown or unimportant, but most leading figures of the time seem to have expressed themselves, often with delightful pungency, about Montaigne. Guizot wrote of him in 1812 as one who 'douta de la vérité tandis qu'il y arrivait sans cesse' (p. 6). Michelet admits 'une part immense de vérité' (p. 112) in a book that he did not like. Jouffroy, as one might expect, is enthusiastic ('c'est un homme à ma guise', p. 48). So are of course Sainte-Beuve, the chief figure of this book, Flaubert ('c'est singulier comme je suis plein de ce bonhomme-là', p. 61), Mme Desbordes-Valmore, George Sand, Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire (who approves of Montaigne's judgement on monsters, p. 129). For Maine de Biran he was 'un des hommes véritablement redoutables' (p. 104). Others did not like him: Lamartine at one period,

¹ On nous permettra d'ajouter quelques notes sur le texte pour y relever un certain nombre—assez restreint, si on considère l'étendue du poème—d'erreurs, d'omissions ou de fautes d'impression.

Eden 582 vers long; lire: Que ny l'esprit *humain*.

Impost. 203 lire *C'est*; *ibid.* 317 note: il ne s'agit pas d'un domestique. *Le larron apprentif* signifie le voleur novice et peu hardi; *ibid.* 576: omettre la virgule.

Furies 382: lire *des os*. *Artif.* 537: lire *sorte*. *Arche* 26: vers court; lire: *luy* perd?; *ibid.* 54 et vocabulaire: *desert* ne signifie pas *thirsty*; *ibid.* 537: au lieu de *Rien du*, lire *Rient du*. *Babyl.* 190: au lieu de *païsans* lire *païsans* (2 syll.); *ibid.* 422. lire *il*. *Vocat.* 233: lire *labouriers*; *ibid.* 1236. lire *colleut*. *Peres* 152-4 note. *Touraine* *Loy* 952: *Pour tant* en deux mots; *ibid.* 1246 correction inutile. *Capit.* 368: lire *Estonné*; *ibid.* 687: correction inutile. *Trophées* 434: vers court; il manque un *pas* ou un *point*; *ibid.* 489: point et virgule après *bonheur*. *Magn.* 766: vers long; omettre *De*; *ibid.* 970: vers court; lire *un aigre-dour*; *ibid.* 1091: vers court; répéter *vanité*. *Décad.* 222: vers long; lire *Tissu*; *ibid.* 673. vers long; lire *Campe*.

Lamennais, Cousin. Victor Hugo speaks of him only perfunctorily, as does Stendhal, Balzac apparently not at all.

The growing attraction of Montaigne for the general public is shown by Mr Frame in a rather dubiously schematic way. We learn how many writers before a certain date, and how many after, refer to him as 'profound' (p. 131), and what were the adjectives most often applied in the two halves of the period under review. This is all very well, but of minor importance for the history of Montaigne in France; that history is not in clichés and epithets but in the impact of a thinker on kindred spirits. Mr Frame seems unaware of this, he is hardly interested in anything more than explicit opinions. The only case of influence treated is Sainte-Beuve. He is silent, or inadequate, on the thought of some of the most significant men: Stendhal, Joubert, Jouffroy, Maine de Biran, each one of whom is of more importance than a dozen of the carefully-listed minor writers. His book is pleasant to read and precise in details, but it leaves the core of its subject unexplored, and thus brings many new, but few important, facts to light. There are mistakes on pp. 12 and 113 and the barbarous form 'Romanticist' is frequent.

W. G. MOORE.

OXFORD.

Charles-Guillaume Etienne, dramatist and publicist (1777-1845). By CHARLES BEAUMONT WICKS. (*Johns Hopkins Studies in Romance Literature and Languages*, vol. XXXVIII.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press; London: H. Milford, Oxford University Press. 1940. 130 pp. \$1.25.

On ne peut guère s'attendre à trouver rien de sensationnel dans une étude sur Ch.-G. Etienne. Cet auteur très secondaire écrivit sous le Premier Empire, qu'il servait comme rédacteur-censeur du *Journal de l'Empire*, puis comme chef de la censure, une vingtaine de pièces de théâtre qui sont aujourd'hui, à une ou deux exceptions près, justement oubliées. Qu'il ait été, avec Picard, Andrieux et Alexandre Duval, un des principaux fournisseurs des scènes impériales n'est pas un titre de gloire, car cette période n'est pas une époque brillante du théâtre français. Plus tard, sous la Restauration et sous la Monarchie de Juillet, Etienne fit une carrière honorable d'homme politique et de publiciste: mais ses œuvres de cette époque n'ont qu'un intérêt rétrospectif. M. Wicks heureusement ne s'exagère pas le mérite et l'importance de cet écrivain: il se propose simplement de caractériser son œuvre et de lui marquer sa place. Son étude comprend 7 chapitres: vie d'Etienne, ses premières pièces, ses comédies en prose, ses opéras comiques, sa comédie des *Deux Gendres* et la querelle qu'elle souleva, ses autres comédies en vers, sa critique littéraire et ses autres œuvres en prose.

La documentation de M. Wicks présente des lacunes. Il n'utilise pas des études antérieures sur la littérature de cette époque, comme le livre

de Bellier-Dumaine sur *Alexandre Duval* (Paris Rennes, 1905), ou celui de Des Granges sur la *Presse littéraire sous la Restauration* (Paris, 1907): il ne semble pas connaître l'ouvrage de Muret sur *L'histoire par le Théâtre* (1865). Il ne mentionne pas non plus la *Biographie des hommes vivants* (t. II, 1816-1817), ni la *Nouvelle Biographie des contemporains*, d'Arnault, Jay, Jouy, etc. (1822), ni la deuxième édition de la *Biographie Universelle* de Michaut, qui contient au t. XIII (1855) une très substantielle notice, par Ch. Lesseps, postérieure au livre de Thiessé, et plus objective. Il aurait fallu aussi consulter les correspondances et les mémoires de l'époque: les *Mémoires d'Outre-tombe*, où Chateaubriand mentionne à plusieurs reprises Etienne, et cite une lettre de lui, datée de 1826, époque à laquelle Chateaubriand, ayant passé à l'opposition, devenait un allié des libéraux; la *Correspondance* de Béranger (1860), qui contient deux lettres du poète libéral à Etienne, datées de 1816 et de 1827; les *Souvenirs d'un académicien*, de Ch. Brifaut, publiés en 1921 par le Dr Cabanès: on y trouve la reproduction d'un grand tableau de Heim (musée de Versailles) où Etienne figure parmi les hommes de lettres qui assistent à une lecture au foyer de la Comédie Française; les *Mémoires* de Savary, duc de Rovigo, qui, comme ministre de la police, fut le chef hiérarchique d'Etienne; les *Souvenirs* du libraire J. N. Barba (1846) qui consacre une page à Etienne et prend sa défense à propos des *Deux Gendres*; l'*Ermit en province*, où Jouy parle d'Etienne à l'occasion d'une visite à sa maison de campagne à Sorcy (Meuse), les *Mémoires* de la comtesse de Boigne, qui relatent une audience accordée à Etienne, en 1814, par l'empereur Alexandre. Et l'on trouverait sans doute bien d'autres renseignements dans des correspondances ou mémoires du temps, qu'il ne m'est pas possible de consulter. M. Wicks n'utilise pas non plus les textes du *Racine et Shakespeare* de Stendhal qui concernent Etienne. On s'étonne surtout qu'il ne tire pas meilleur parti du discours, qu'il connaît pourtant, d'Alfred de Vigny, successeur au fauteuil d'Etienne à l'Académie Française, et qu'il ne mentionne même pas la réponse de Molé. Vigny rapporte qu'Etienne dans sa jeunesse, fut en relations avec Mademoiselle Clairon, et qu'elle lui légua sa bibliothèque, comme avait fait jadis Ninon de Lenclos pour le jeune Voltaire. A propos de *l'Intrigante*, cette comédie d'Etienne que Napoléon voulut voir à Saint-Cloud, et qu'il interdit parce qu'on pouvait y trouver des allusions satiriques aux mariages qu'il désirait entre ses généraux et les héritières de l'ancienne noblesse, Vigny s'était plu à camper son prédécesseur dans une attitude avantageuse de poète indépendant: Molé, dans son discours, remit les choses au point.

La personnalité d'Etienne ne ressort pas nettement du livre de M. Wicks. Il cite le témoignage de Grille qui, dans ses *Miettes*, reproche à cet écrivain d'avoir manqué de caractère. En général pourtant l'opinion de ses contemporains lui est nettement favorable. Barba déclare dans ses *Souvenirs*: 'J'ai eu l'honneur d'être lié d'intérêts et d'amitié avec Etienne, et je n'ai eu qu'à me louer de ses procédés.' Et Savary, dans

ses *Mémoires*: 'J'aurais bien des nobles traits à citer de cet homme d'un esprit si brillant et d'un cœur si droit.' M. Wicks accuse Etienne d'opportunisme: pourtant il rappelle lui-même que le gouvernement de la première Restauration avait fait des avances à Etienne, qu'Etienne les avait repoussées, et qu'après les Cent Jours il fut persécuté. Que dirait M. Wicks si Etienne, comme d'autres fonctionnaires, après avoir servi l'Empire, avait servi la Restauration? Il est vrai qu'après avoir dirigé la censure impériale Etienne ne cessa d'attaquer la censure de la Restauration: Sainte-Beuve souligne cette contradiction et l'attribue à une 'transformation habile et concertée'. La contradiction est peut-être plus apparente que réelle, si l'on considère la situation politique dans son ensemble. Beaucoup d'ex-bonapartistes furent libéraux sous la Restauration pour d'autres raisons que des déceptions ou des ambitions personnelles, et sans qu'on puisse les taxer d'illogisme ou d'insincérité. La Restauration avait accordé la Charte, mais elle avait ramené les émigrés: les ultras subissaient la Charte à contre-cœur. La Congrégation répandait dans le royaume son despotisme clérical. Une hiérarchie nobiliaire, à laquelle l'Empire avait voulu substituer une hiérarchie du mérite, reprenait les postes de direction, avec ses rancunes et son esprit de caste. Il est naturel que d'anciens fonctionnaires impériaux aient difficilement supporté cette atmosphère d'ancien régime et de cléricalisme ultramontain: le contraste faisait comprendre que Napoléon, en dépit de son gouvernement despotique et du Concordat, avait incarné l'esprit égalitaire et laïque de la Révolution. Un épisode significatif, à cet égard, est cette édition de *Tartuffe*, avec introduction et notes, qu'Etienne publia en 1824. S'il rappelle avec insistance que Louis XIV avait soutenu Molière contre les dévots, ce n'est pas, comme pense M. Wicks (p. 108), par opportunisme et pour flatter les Bourbons de 1824, mais au contraire pour intimider les ministres réactionnaires de la Restauration, à une époque où les représentations de *Tartuffe* obtenaient en France un succès si vif qu'ils auraient bien voulu les interdire, s'ils n'avaient craint de renier le glorieux ancêtre de la dynastie et de mettre en contraste son libéralisme relatif avec l'intolérance cléricale de ses descendants. Tactique habile d'un des 'leaders' du parti libéral.

C'est sur l'œuvre dramatique d'Etienne que M. Wicks concentre son étude. Il énumère toutes ces pièces légères où d'abord l'écrivain se fit la main: vaudevilles, impromptus, 'folies', livrets d'opéras comiques ou d'opéras féeries, petites comédies en prose: il indique les sujets, les sources, le succès. Etienne n'a pas beaucoup d'invention, ni de grands dons dramatiques: son principal mérite est l'aisance aimable avec laquelle il tourne la tirade ou le couplet. Le succès fut parfois très vif: encore revenait-il, pour une part, aux auteurs avec lesquels Etienne collaborait, ou aux compositeurs, Dalayrac, Méhul, Nicolo, pour lesquels il écrivait des livrets. Un de ses opéras comiques, *Joconde ou les coureurs d'aventures* (1814, musique de Nicolo), où Etienne reprenait un épisode des *Mille et une nuits*, déjà utilisé par l'Arioste et par La Fontaine, fut vraiment

populaire. M. Wicks rappelle (p. 71, n. 26) que Vautrin, dans *le Père Goriot*, fredonne à plusieurs reprises un couplet de cet opéra: 'J'ai longtemps parcouru le monde. . .'. Il pourrait mentionner aussi que c'est *Joconde*, et vraisemblablement ce même couplet, que chantait 'à pleine voix' le jeune Vigny, tout fier de son uniforme rouge et de son manteau blanc de gendarme de la Maison du Roi, tandis qu'il suivait à cheval, sur la route d'Artois et de Flandre, l'escorte de Louis XVIII en fuite devant les lanciers de Napoléon (*Servitude et grandeur militaires*, début de *Laurette ou le cachet rouge*). Si cet opéra fut si populaire en 1814-1815, c'est qu'il exprimait ce goût de vie aventureuse que les Bulletins de la Grande Armée avaient exalté dans la jeune génération. M. Wicks devrait citer ces couplets, pour leur signification historique sinon pour leur valeur intrinsèque, plutôt que tels extraits moins représentatifs qu'il donne comme spécimens de la manière de l'écrivain.

Rendu plus ambitieux par ses succès dans des pièces légères, Etienne aborda aussi le genre plus relevé de la comédie en vers, dans la tradition de Molière et de Destouches. De ses œuvres dans ce genre deux seulement lui survécurent: *Brueys et Palaprat*, aimable comédie anecdotique, en un acte, et *Les deux gendres*, son œuvre principale (1810): c'est une comédie sérieuse en cinq actes, mi-comédie de mœurs, mi-comédie de caractères, et dans laquelle il met en scène, après beaucoup d'autres, des conflits d'intérêts, dans une même famille, entre deux générations. Cette œuvre souleva une retentissante querelle: on accusa Etienne d'avoir plagié un jésuite du XVII^e siècle, auteur d'une pièce intitulée *Conaxa ou les gendres dupés*, dont il semble bien qu'il avait eu connaissance, au moins indirectement. Les brochures qui furent publiées à ce sujet, en 1811-1812, remplissent trois volumes de la collection Rondel, mais le débat ne présente plus pour nous qu'un intérêt relatif: aucune question de doctrine n'y est impliquée, et l'on s'étonne que l'opinion publique ait pu se passionner si longtemps sur un si mince sujet. M. Wicks consacre 15 pages à l'analyse de tous ces pamphlets: il aurait pu abréger cet exposé, et, par contre, discuter ce que la pièce d'Etienne pouvait devoir au *Roi Lear*—question qu'il pose, mais qu'il élude, on ne sait pourquoi—et marquer avec plus de précision l'influence qu'elle a pu exercer sur Balzac quand il écrivit *le Père Goriot*.

A toute la seconde partie de la vie d'Etienne, à sa carrière d'homme politique et de journaliste, à sa critique littéraire et à ses œuvres diverses M. Wicks ne consacre qu'un chapitre. De propos délibéré il ne parle de sa vie politique que dans la mesure où elle touche à sa vie littéraire. Cette distinction, sous la Restauration, se justifie mal: ce n'est pas par habitude personnelle qu'Etienne mêle constamment la politique à la littérature: ce mélange continuél caractérise toute l'époque: la polémique littéraire est alors une forme de la polémique politique, et c'est dans le journalisme littéraire que de futurs hommes d'Etat, comme Guizot et Thiers, commencent leur carrière politique. Tandis que les jeunes romantiques de 1820, admirateurs et disciples de Chateaubriand, sont

comme lui catholiques et royalistes, les 'leaders' de l'opposition libérale, héritiers spirituels du XVIII^e siècle, affirment leur attachement à l'esthétique classique. Etienne bataille contre les romantiques parce qu'il appartient à la génération antérieure, nourrie de Voltaire, et comme lui libérale en politique, mais classique de goût. Cette étrange contamination de la politique et de la littérature fait qu'en 1820 les traditionalistes en politique sont novateurs en littérature, et inversement : illogisme dont Hugo discerne bien l'origine quand il déclare en 1827 que 'la queue du dix-huitième siècle traîne encore dans le dix-neuvième' (*Préface de Cromwell*). Il faudra que Stendhal, puis les rédacteurs du *Globe*, donnent l'exemple de convictions libérales associées avec des goûts romantiques, et que Chateaubriand, disgracié, passe à l'opposition, pour que l'idéal romantique de liberté dans l'art se dégage de tout dogmatisme politique ou religieux, et que Hugo lance sa formule 'le romantisme est le libéralisme en littérature' (*Préface d'Hernani*). Mais les libéraux voltairiens de la génération antérieure gardaient leurs préventions. Etienne finit-il par admettre le goût nouveau? Sainte-Beuve rapporte qu'il était 'passionné et impossible à ramener dans ses antipathies littéraires'. Pourtant Vigny déclare dans son discours qu'Etienne avait tardivement rendu justice aux romantiques. De fait un certain progrès apparaît, dans le sens de la modernité, quand on compare telle déclaration d'Etienne en 1829 (citée par M. Wicks, p. 113) avec ses jugements de 1822 (p. 107). Il faudrait voir ce qu'il a dit plus tard, par exemple en 1834 dans un article, signé de lui, du *Journal des Débats* (21 juin) sur Schiller. L'œuvre critique d'Etienne offrait une occasion d'étudier cette attitude des libéraux anti-romantiques, dont le jugement s'était formé avant la Révolution, et de suivre l'évolution de leur goût, que les audaces de la jeune école déconcertaient.

La conclusion de M. Wicks est surtout un résumé. Dans la mesure où elle s'efforce de situer l'œuvre d'Etienne dans l'histoire du théâtre français elle est parfois contestable. Il semble exagéré de voir en lui un précurseur de la *pièce à thèse*. Si l'on donne ce titre à toute pièce de théâtre qui pose un problème moral ou social, il n'est guère de comédie sérieuse, depuis et y compris Molière, qui n'y ait droit. Pour conserver à cette appellation un sens précis, il conviendrait de ne pas en abuser, de la réserver pour des œuvres qui ont un caractère bien marqué d'actualité, et qui manifestent, ou même proclament une intention d'orienter l'opinion publique vers une réforme bien définie des mœurs ou de la législation.

EDM. EGGLI.

LIVERPOOL.

Essays in Translation from French. By R. L. GRAEME RITCHIE and CLAUDINE I. SIMONS. Cambridge: University Press. 1941. vii+405 pp. 15s.

French Passages for Translation. By R. L. GRAEME RITCHIE and CLAUDINE I. SIMONS. Cambridge: University Press. 1941. viii+169 pp. 5s.

With the march of time translation is destined to play a part of constantly increasing importance in the modern world. Works in the most various branches of learning, which the student cannot afford to overlook, daily appear in more and more languages. To the many they can only be accessible in translation. Simultaneously there is growing up an ever wider public for the purely literary output of foreign countries. It is not surprising therefore that in recent years essays on the art of translation should have been numerous and often excellent. Amongst the most practically useful must still be reckoned the masterly introduction to Ritchie and Moore's *Translation from French* published in 1918 by the Cambridge University Press. It is hard to believe that nearly a quarter of a century has intervened between the appearance of that well-known and still justly popular manual and its sequel, the present *Essays in Translation from French*, the joint achievement of Professor R. L. Graeme Ritchie and Dr Claudine I. Simons. This consists of 114 passages from modern French authors of outstanding repute (92 in prose and 22 in verse) with model English renderings opposite them. It provides teaching by example of first-rate value.

Translations are liable to two principal defects. They err either by infidelity to the original through excessive paraphrase or by strained and unnatural English due to servile clinging to the vocabulary and especially the syntax of the text. Not so with these translations. If it is admitted that translation must by its very nature be always a striving towards an unattainable ideal, the more unattainable the more it is worthy of attainment, and can at best achieve the closest possible approximation in sense and value to the original, there can be no doubt that from the present essays the student may by careful comparison between text and rendering derive quite invaluable insight into the method and subtleties of the craft. They offer a uniformly high level of performance.

The Cambridge University Press publishes simultaneously, also by Ritchie and Simons, *French Passages for Translation*. This contains a considerable number of the passages of which model renderings figure in the *Essays in Translation*. A synoptical table at the end of the latter facilitates identification of the passages common to these two books and to the *Translation from French* mentioned above.

J. W. JEAFFRESON.

LONDON.

The Redentin Easter Play. Translated from the Low German of the Fifteenth Century with Introduction and Notes. By A. E. ZUCKER. New York: Columbia University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1941. 134 pp. 13s. 6d.

This work belongs to the series 'Records of Civilization. Sources and Studies', and is therefore popularized learning rather than original scholarship. There can be no doubt that the Redentin play has considerable literary merit and is a valuable historical document. In his Introduction Mr Zucker makes some excellent observations about medieval stagecraft and the Redentin drama, but the first section on the general development of Easter plays is less satisfactory. There are some very sweeping statements, such as 'In the Middle Ages the very name and conception of drama were lost', 'The medieval German drama' was 'born at the foot of the altar'. One begins to wonder how the *mimi* and *joculatores* of the Middle Ages managed to earn their living at all and how the Shrovetide plays came into existence. In recent years there has been a tendency to stress secular contributions to medieval drama. There is a very good general survey of the position by Professor Pascal in the *Modern Language Review*, xxxvi (1941), to which Mr Zucker's attention is respectfully drawn.

Where are we to seek the home of liturgical drama? One of the crucial points to consider is the authorship and provenance of the *Quem quaeritis* trope. Mr Zucker tells us that it was 'composed about the year 900 by a cleric in the monastery of St Gall as an embellishment of the Easter Mass'. As it happens, the oldest manuscript containing the *Quem quaeritis* is from St Martial, Limoges (c. 925), vide *Analecta Hymnica Medii Aevi* (ed. Blume and Bannister, Leipzig, 1911), xlix, 9-10. The oldest version written at St Gall is in an antiphonary of the eleventh century! The ascription of the trope to Tuotilo is a legend incapable of proof, put forward by uncritical writers and duly copied by subsequent compilers; it rests on a late and unreliable tradition. There is not the slightest real evidence that the *Quem quaeritis* was written by Tuotilo or by any other St Gall monk. It is true that it is to be found in St Gall MS. no. 484, which also contains the sequences and tropes attributed to Tuotilo and Notker, but of the thirty tropes in the codex only five were ever ascribed to Tuotilo in the whole of the Middle Ages! The claims of Limoges and other French monasteries to be regarded as the *fons et origo* of liturgical drama must be considered and I feel convinced that later research will justify these claims.

The translation of the Redentin play is in the main correct, but there are occasional lapses, such as 'carp roaster' for 'kropelroster' (v. 1133), High German 'Krapfenröster'. 'Krapfen' is 'carp', but 'kropen' or 'Krapfen' means 'fritter'. 'Her scriver' (v. 998) does not mean 'Here, scribe', but 'worthy scribe' (Herr Schreiber).

JAMES M. CLARK.

The Prussian Spirit. A Survey of German Literature and Politics 1914-1940. By S. D. STIRK. London: Faber and Faber. 1941. 235 pp. 12s. 6d.

At the end of the preface Dr Stirk says of his book: 'To quote the words placed by Thomas Mann at the head of his essay on "Friedrich und die Grosse Koalition" (1914), it is "A sketch written for the day and the hour" [Ein Abriss für den Tag und die Stunde]. It is intended as a "war-book", and as such it should be judged.' This sounds somewhat ominous. Mann's essay was written at the beginning of the last war, and showed a spirit fundamentally different from that of his later settled convictions. He was, as Dr Stirk himself records (p. 107), 'to become one of the foremost opponents of Prussianism and Hitlerism', and 'it is strange to think that this splendid example of Prussian and Nazi apologetics comes from the pen of such a great democrat and liberal' (p. 109). The analogy is forced upon us, but how far are we to apply it to the present book? And how are we to judge the book as a 'war-book', and not review it purely and simply as a book?

It would, however, be a mistake to assume from this perhaps unfortunate introduction that the book deals in fulminating propaganda or one-sided denunciation. Dr Stirk in fact states his purpose very definitely on various occasions. The Preface tells us that 'its main theme is that Hitlerism is fundamentally a continuation of Prussianism', and 'for the most part Prussianism of the very worst kind, so much so that it may even be regarded as a perversion of Prussianism'. Yet 'all sweeping indictments and condemnations of the Prussians are avoided, and their good and enduring qualities are appraised'. The author even fears that his attempt to do justice to Prussianism may be misunderstood, and considers it necessary to safeguard himself against any charge of a too favourable treatment: 'Once again it must be denied that this book is an attempt to "whitewash" the Prussians' (p. 218).

The book consists of an Introduction, Part I (Weimar and Potsdam, 1919-33), Part II (Prussia and the Third Empire, 1933-40), with a final chapter, Retrospect and Prospect, which forms a kind of 'conclusion'. The Introduction compares English opinion concerning Prussia in 1914-18 and in 1939-40. 'If there was one thing of which English people from 1914 to 1918 were convinced, it was that the fight was against Prussia and Prussianism', he says. He adduces some of the 'war-books', Ramsay Muir, W. H. Dawson and others. He might well have included Sir Michael (then Dr M. E.) Sadler's little fourteen-page pamphlet, *Modern Germany and the Modern World*. There the whole matter is put in a nut-shell, and the words, 'The Prussian tradition, however much it may owe in its origin to a racial difference, is now a state of mind', anticipate Dr Stirk's words in the preface: 'The reader will soon perceive that the word Prussian is not used here in any strict geographical or racial sense, and is not applied exclusively to the inhabitants of the former kingdom of Prussia. The Prussian spirit is active all over Germany.'

In Part I 'the spirit of Potsdam is represented by Moeller van den Bruck, Oswald Spengler, Wilhelm Stäfel, Walter Flex, Ernst Junger, by panegyrists of Frederick the Great, and finally by Hitler and Rosenberg; and the spirit of Weimar by Fritz von Unruh, Carl Zuckmayer (*The Captain of Kopernick*) and Werner Hagemann (*Anti-Frederick*). Flex, Unruh and Junger are grouped together as 'Three Prussian Officers of the first Great War'. Light relief is provided by a full-scale presentation of the action of Zuckmayer's play, and stress is laid on the typical popularity of that good-humoured skit on Prussian officialdom during the careless optimistic days of the Weimar Republic, when 'many Germans thought that the Prussian vices had been largely overcome and left behind'.

In Part II 'an attempt is made to show, firstly, how the Prussians, headed by Hindenburg and by men like Carl Dryssen, Friedrich Schinkel and August Winnig, let the Nazis in and welcomed them; secondly, how the Nazis did all they could to exploit the Prussian past; and finally, how some of the best and most genuine Prussians expressed their opposition'. The opposition is represented by Pastor Niemöller and Ernst Wiechert. The Nazi exploitation deals largely with Kleist and Fichte, and with four Nazi writers of 1933-9, Anne Marie Koeppen, Hans Rehlberg, Hans Schwarz and Werner Beumelburg. This part does to some extent justify Dr Stirik's statement in the preface that his book is 'an enquiry into the psychology of the German people... as reflected and expressed in recent German literature', but in the book as a whole 'literature' in the generally accepted sense of the term hardly plays the chief part, most of the authors dealt with being historians, philosophers and sociologists.

One of the subjects on which Dr Stirik dwells is the nature of Prussian socialism, and his treatment of the theme is one of the most interesting features of the book. It is too widely assumed in this country that the 'Socialism' part of the National Socialism formula has no real meaning. It is, as a matter of fact, one of the elements of strength taken over from Prussianism by the Nazis, and exploited by them as appealing to fundamental qualities of the German character. It is seen in its simplest form in the Prussianism of Frederick William I, the 'Ur-Preusse', the 'Nur-Preusse'. His state was a community consisting of three estates: soldiers, officials and peasants, to which there was grudgingly added a fourth—that of the middle classes and the industrial workers. Prussian socialism still envisages a community which allots to each his definite setting and station in life, in which he works for the common good. It is very much the old Tory feudal conception of doing your duty in that state of life to which it has pleased God to call you.

The realization is gradually gaining ground that the strength of the original Nazi theory (as distinct from its practice) lay in its combination of this conception of Socialism—Prussian in origin but accepted for its success by the rest of Germany—with a Romanticism which supplied the emotional impulse. It is Romanticism which furnishes the dreams

and the fanatical fervour, the mystic conception of 'Das dritte Reich', which shall link the glories of Germany's future with the glories of Germany's past. This is Dr Stirk's conclusion (p. 221): 'it was just this combination of Prussianism with Romanticism in Germany since 1871, and increasingly since 1919, which has proved so dangerous, not only to Germany itself, but to the rest of Europe and the world.' 'The Nazi coordination of Prussianism and Romanticism' is also stressed by R. D'O. Butler in his very valuable book, *The Roots of National Socialism*, and he describes National Socialism as being 'national at root, historical in growth, and romantic in impulse'. The pervasion of the whole life and policy of Germany by a spirit of Romanticism is a matter of particular interest to all students of German literature.

This is not a political journal, and while we are of course vitally concerned with anything which will help to an understanding of the Prussian or the German spirit, this is not the place to discuss Dr Stirk's ideas for a peace settlement. But whatever their views, readers will find here a collection of sketches and a mass of documentary evidence, set out in an interesting and sometimes amusing way, from which they can draw lessons of their own.

H. G. ATKINS.

LONDON.

SHORT NOTICES

For the twenty-sixth volume of *Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association*, 1940 (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1941. 112 pp. 7s. 6d.), Mr Arundell Esdaile has collected six papers on subjects ranging from the fifteenth century to the nineteenth. In 'Aspects of Style and Idiom in Fifteenth-Century English' Professor H. C. Wyld deals with changes of vocabulary, word-order and syntax—a most important part of the history of our language, and one which is too often unduly neglected. Mrs Evelyn Simpson gives reason for believing that the Dobell manuscript now in Harvard College Library, a representative collection of Donne's works, was made for the Countess of Montgomery and derived from an authoritative source; she examines the text of the *Divine Poems* in the light of this manuscript, showing how frequently it gives what appears to be Donne's original text. Mr Hugh Macdonald gives an interesting survey of 'Some Poetical Miscellanies, 1672–1716', and Mrs Katharine A. Esdaile 'attempts' (and achieves) a full-length portrait of 'The Real Thomas Amory', disentangling the autobiographical passages in his work and showing how far he can be equated with his hero John Bunce. Miss D. M. Stuart examines 'Landscape in Augustan Verse', tracing its conventional features from poet to poet till 'the trammels

of Augustan classicism' loosen at the end of the century. Last in chronological order, though first in the book, comes 'Tennyson and the Theory of Evolution', in which Mr W. R. Rutland shows how deeply Tennyson's creative thought was rooted in the scientific theories of his age and vindicates anew his position as 'the poet of Science'. An interesting and varied collection.

WINIFRED HUSBANDS.

LONDON.

The English Institute Annual; 1940 (New York: Columbia University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1941. xi+228 pp. 13s. 6d.) is dedicated to Professor Carleton Brown, to whom the Institute owes much. This second volume of the *Proceedings* of the Institute contains matters of varied, if unequal, interest to scholars. The papers printed in it all reflect a thoughtful attention to critical problems of importance, and must have evoked stimulating discussion. The opening chapters convey, perhaps too plainly, a series of animadversions upon an older generation of scholars with established standing, though names are rarely given, in respect of American scholars never. The invocation of Mr Richards, Mr Empson, and Mr Eliot is frequent, and occasionally, e.g. on p. 107, there is some appeal to faction. One is bound to wonder who are, in fact, the 'Old Lights' who have no interest in 'value' (p. 97) and it is difficult to conceive it possible that Saintsbury's attitude towards literary appreciation should be so caricatured as it is here (pp. 98-104). The writer can hardly have read the critical works, much less heard a lecture, of this apostle of gusto. Occasionally one finds a dictum which loses either significance or truth when critically examined, e.g. 'more of the great art of the past is obsolete than certain critics pretend' (p. 106). 'Great' must be deleted if this is to be true, and if so it is a truism; 'pretend' conveys an unfair accusation.

The most secure essays in the volume are after all those which are content to add to knowledge, and do not engage in polemics, e.g. Mr Pforzheimer's 'Copyright and Scholarship', and Mr Hayden Clark's 'Intellectual History'. It may be hoped that some others of the papers given at the meetings of the Institute may find their way into print, e.g. the interesting series on bibliographical evidence for the dating of books recorded on p. 206.

C. J. SISSON.

LONDON.

The *Modern Language Review* is more concerned with works of scholarship than with creative contemporary literature, but Mr René Balbaud's *Cette Drôle de Guerre* (London: Oxford University Press. 1941. viii+111 pp. 3s. 6d.) merits notice wherever France and the literature of France are matters of interest and of importance. This vivid account of the disastrous campaign of 1940 has both personal and documentary integrity, and is

written in a living language, photographic without retouch. The language, indeed, has odd features here and there, with all allowance made for transcription and assembly of rough notes, and too many errors have been allowed to escape in the printing. A second edition should receive thorough revision. The book deserves it. It breathes the spirit of the France of yesterday and of tomorrow.

C. J. SISSON.

LONDON.

Immediately following his two informative papers on *The Growth of American English* comes Sir William Craigie's monograph on *Completing the Record of English* (S.P.E. Tract, LVIII. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1941. 38 pp. 3s. 6d.), in which the senior living editor of the *New English Dictionary* surveys once more the whole field of English lexicography. Incidentally, he reminds users of the Dictionary that that work of reference does not claim to present, infallibly and in all instances, the earliest examples of words, senses and phrases, that may be found recorded. The reminder is both timely and apposite. There are still critics, whether 'appreciative or captious', who 'express surprise that the editors have missed something which they happen to have noted or looked for'. Sir William here discusses at length many such interesting instances from Pepys, Swift, Defoe, Henry Brooke and others, which anticipate the record in the Dictionary by many years, some by a century or more. For the most part, they are familiar nominal compounds like *boat-house*, *bow-window*, *Civil Service*, *Cockney dialect*, *eight-day clock*, *home mission* and *marching orders*. In four appended lists these are arranged alphabetically for convenience of reference: earlier examples than those recorded in the Dictionary; later examples; hitherto unlisted instances which fill gaps in the sequence of illustrative quotations; and, lastly, expressions not entered in the Dictionary or not illustrated by quotations. But this Tract is far more than a mere discussion of new material for the lexicographer. Like the author's stimulating Presidential Address (1934) to the Modern Humanities Research Association on *Major Tasks in English Studies*, it indicates, definitely and with authority, the lines along which younger and less experienced students of our ever-widening vocabulary may work most profitably.

SIMEON POTTER.

SOUTHAMPTON.

Vingt Contes Favoris, chosen and edited by F. E. Guyer and A. G. Bovée (New York and London: Oxford University Press. 1941. viii+425 pp. 9s. 6d.), is, for war time, a rather sumptuous reprint, good print on excellent paper, published in New York, of a score of the best-known short stories by outstanding nineteenth-century French writers: Maupassant, Daudet, Mérimée, Zola, Sardou, Coppée and Balzac. The volume contains in addition: (a) Questions based on the texts for conversational

practice. Such questions are nowadays the regular adjunct of books designed for the teaching of modern languages in accordance with the direct method. Their utility might appear dubious, for certainly they could be improvised by any competent teacher whilst for the pupil to have before his eyes the *printed* question is surely to defeat the main purpose and advantage of oral teaching. (b) English sentences for translation into French, these involving only words and constructions met with in the reading matter. These are certainly useful though it is a trifle surprising that for pupils sufficiently advanced to read the present texts this kind of exercise should be restricted to the isolated sentence and not carried forward at least to the stage of elementary consecutive prose. (c) A very complete French-English vocabulary.

Particularly difficult expressions and allusions are explained in brief footnotes and the essential facts about each author are given in a short preface to his stories.

J. W. JEAFFRESON.

LONDON.

Professor R. L. Graeme Ritchie's *French Fair Copies* of the passages in *A New Manual of French Composition* (Cambridge: University Press. 1941. iii+194 pp. 10s. 6d.) is a volume which will be warmly welcomed by those whose task it is to teach the difficult art of French prose composition to university students and the higher forms of secondary schools. It will also prove of invaluable assistance to such as are compelled to rely, as must be increasingly the case at the present time, upon self-tuition. Although the book is necessarily a trifle expensive there can be no doubt that it is good value for the money. The two hundred fair copies represent originals of the widest variety of subject and style; the more difficult are accompanied by concise but extremely useful notes suggesting variants or supplying terse comments upon words and phrases the precise meaning and value of which are likely not to have been fully appreciated by many students. Perhaps among the most interesting and useful notes are those that prove a rendering which might at first glance appear unduly free to be fully justified when the implications, not always obvious, of the English text have been thoroughly grasped. The translations, uniformly excellent, are the work of various hands, and Professor Ritchie is to be congratulated upon having secured the assistance of so many talented collaborators, inasmuch as every translator, however competent, possesses of necessity his own 'manner' more congenial to some texts than to others. By this distribution of labour he has ensured for the fair copies a diversity parallel to that of the originals and has furnished precious material for the pondering of the student alive to the finer points of style, French and English.

J. W. JEAFFRESON.

LONDON.

In Catalonia one finds place-names in *-dunum*, 'fortified enclosure', and *-acum*, 'agricultural settlement', such as *Salardú*, *Besalú*, *Verdú*, *Masarac*, *Llorac*, *Breissac*. The terminations are certainly Celtic, and they are used with a sense of fitness for the sites, which seems to imply the presence of Celtic speakers. There are also traces of the Celtic *Bergusii* and *Gessorienses*. In historical times, however, Catalonia is strictly Iberian territory. How account for these names? Dr Pedro Bosch Gimpera, in his Rhÿs Lecture before the British Academy (*Two Celtic Waves in Spain*, Oxford Univ. Press, 1939, 126 pp. with plates and maps, 9s. 6d.), connects these traces with the Hallstatt B civilization on the ground of common form and design of pots. Hallstatt was a Celtic centre in southern Germany, and the culture in question flourished about 1200–900 B.C. Unluckily for us who are not archaeologists, there appears to be a schism among the learned about these pots, which some—apparently a majority—have taken to be 'Illyrian', for reasons one is not qualified to weigh. Dr Bosch Gimpera's argument turns on itself at this point. From the fact that there must have been Celts in Catalonia, and that they could not have been a dominant force after the Iberians became fully established, it follows that Hallstatt B is purely Celtic. I am not quite sure that the argument exhausts the possibilities. Could the linguistic details have entered at some later date from France, like our own *-villes*? However, this is the first wave. The second wave had three crests: the first carried the Cempsii to the far west about 650 B.C., then came the Sefes about 600, and finally Belgic hordes who settled densely on the Spanish *meseta* about 550. The Celtic settlements, the lecturer holds, were only thick on the sparsely populated uplands, where they could develop their wheat; the populous, commercial south and seaboard remained in the hands of other nations.

W. J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

Miss Madaline W. Nichols has edited a very useful *Bibliographical Guide to Materials on American Spanish* for the American Council of Learned Societies (Harvard and Oxford University Presses. 1941. xii + 114 pp.). Many bibliographies defeat their own end by massing materials without discrimination, and nowhere is this more easily done than in discussions of 'American Spanish', which is the prey of the amateur and the journalist. Miss Nichols avoids this difficulty by three devices: she stars really important works, gives summaries of contents, and often reproduces some brief judgement, usually by Sr Amado Alonso. With this clue to what really matters the bibliography can indulge in the luxury of exhaustiveness. The American academies are listed, and their publications noted. There is also a section devoted to *Institutos de Filología*, of which the most important is that directed by Dr Alonso in the University of Buenos Aires. I heard in Santiago de Chile that another such institute will soon be set up in connexion with the Central

University and under the capable direction of Dr Rodolfo Oroz. Thanks to Lenz, a Chilean institute would have a flying start.

W. J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD.

From the University of Pennsylvania have come two useful dissertations in the Portuguese field. Dr Norman P. Sacks has discussed *The Latinity of Dated Documents in the Portuguese Territory* (Pennsylvania and Oxford Univ. Presses, 1941, ix+179 pp. \$2). The author shows the whole of his 'working', so that the scholar can review all the material, as well as attend to the useful brief summary on pp. 159-61. By this means certain dates are quite definitely established, such as that intervocalic -L- is sporadically omitted in documents of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, and -N- from the latter part of the ninth, and then increasingly. The two criteria, taken together, divide Portuguese from the Spanish dialects, and yet one notices that they did not occur together, since the loss of -N- was considerably the earlier. This evidence, therefore, goes a considerable distance towards solving the principal problems of Portuguese evolution, but it does not take us all the way, because we are not given information about place. The loss of -N-, for instance, is first recorded in 882 (*elemosnas*), and in 968 we have the suggestive *coimbrie*. But Coimbra was still a Mozarabic city at that date, and for the most of two more centuries Lisbon was pronounced in such a way as to justify the Arabic spelling *Al-Ašbūna*. Frenchmen and Englishmen also heard an *n* in the latter case, and sometimes in the former. The question is always present where, at a given date, was 'Portuguese' spoken: for instance, where was 'Portuguese' in 882, when as yet there was no Portugal? And for how much did the great cultural centre of Santiago de Compostela count in the diffusion of Portuguese particulars?

Dr Joseph H. D. Allen's *Portuguese Word-formation with Suffixes* (Pennsylvania and Oxford Univ. Presses. 1941. 143 pp.) has also appeared as a Supplement to *Language* (vol. xvii, 2, April-June 1941). It is fully documented, and appears to exhaust the subject.

W. J. ENTWISTLE.

OXFORD

NEW PUBLICATIONS

January—March 1942

With the collaboration of PAMELA GRADON (English)

GENERAL

CHADWICK, N. K., *Poetry and Prophecy*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 7s. 6d.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES

Spanish.

JOHNSON, H. L., *An Edition of Triunfo de los Santos with a consideration of Jesuit School Plays in Mexico before 1650*. Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania Press. \$2.00.

Portuguese.

ALLEN, J. H. D., JR., *Portuguese Word-Formation with Suffixes*. [Diss.] Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania.

Cancioneiro da Ajuda. A Diplomatic Edition by H. H. Carter. New York, Mod. Lang. Assoc. Amer.; London, H. Milford. 15s. 6d.

French.

DESCARTES, *Discours de la Méthode*, ed. by G. Gadoffre. Manchester, Univ. Press. 3s. 6d.

FRANCE, A., *Le Livre de Mon Ami*, ed. by J. H. Thomas. Oxford, Blackwell. 6s.
La Grant Ystoire de Monsignor Tristan 'Li Bret', ed. by F. C. Johnson. Edinburgh and London, Oliver and Boyd. 15s.

MESSET, A. DE, *Lorenzaccio*, ed. by P. E. Crump. Manchester, Univ. Press. 3s. 6d.

Studies by Members of the French Department of Yale University (Yale Romanic Studies, xviii). Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s. 6d.

VIDAL DE LA BLACHE, P., *La Personnalité Géographique de la France*, with Preface by H. J. Fleure. Manchester, Univ. Press; London, Hachette. 3s.

VILLON, F., *The Poems of*, ed. by E. F. Chaney. Oxford, Blackwell. 5s.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES

English.

(a) *General (including linguistic)*.

CRAIGIE, Sir W. A., *Completing the Record of English (S.P.E. Tract, LVIII)*. Oxford, Clarendon Press. 3s. 6d.

Dictionary of American English on Historical Principles. Compiled at the Univ. of Chicago. Ed. by Sir William Craigie and J. R. Hulbert. Part XI. HONK—LAND PIRATE. Part XII. LAND PIRATE—MINGO. London, Oxford Univ. Press. 17s. each part.

ELLIS-FERMOR, U., *Masters of Reality*. London, Methuen. 6s.

GOVER, J. E. B., A. MAWER and F. M. STENTON, *The Place-Names of Middlesex, apart from the City of London (E.P.N.S. xviii)*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 18s.

(b) *Old and Middle English.*

CHARLES OF ORLEANS, *The English Poems of*, ed. by R. Steele (E.E.T.S. 215). London, Oxford Univ. Press. 31s. 6d.

Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*, *Sources and Analogues of*, ed. by W. F. Bryan and G. Dempster. Chicago and Cambridge Univ. Presses. 60s.

The Poetical Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn, ed. by R. J. Menner. New York, Mod. Lang. Assoc. Amer.; London, Oxford Univ. Press. 12s.

(c) *Modern English.*

ALLEN, D. C., *The Star-Crossed Renaissance*. Durham, N.C., Duke Univ. Press. \$3.00.

BATTENHOUSE, R. W., *Marlowe's 'Tamburlaine'*. Nashville, Tennessee, Vanderbilt Univ. Press.

Baylor's Old Yellow Manuscripts, trans. by J. E. Shaw and B. Corrigan, with an Introductory Essay by W. G. Raymond. Waco, Texas, Baylor University.

BLUNDEN, E., *Thomas Hardy*. London, Macmillan. 7s. 6d.

Browning's 'Roman Murder Story' as recorded in a hitherto unknown Italian contemporary Manuscript, trans. by E. H. Yarrill, with introduction by W. O. Raymond. Waco, Texas, Baylor University.

Choice of Kipling's Verse, A, made by T. S. Eliot. London, Faber and Faber. 8s. 6d.

COLERIDGE, H., *New Poems*, ed. by E. L. Griggs. 10s. 6d.

DYER, J., *Grongar Hill*, ed. by R. C. Boys. Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press. London, H. Milford. 10s. 6d.

EVANS, W. M., *Henry Lawes*. New York, Mod. Lang. Assoc. Amer.; London, Oxford Univ. Press. 16s. 6d.

FAUSSET, H. L'ANSON, *Walt Whitman. Poet of Democracy*. London, Cape. 12s. 6d.

Florence Farr, Bernard Shaw and W. B. Yeats. Ed. by C. Bax. Dublin, Cuala Press. 18s.

HAWTHORNE, N., *The English Notebooks*, ed. by R. Stewart. New York, Mod. Lang. Assoc. Amer.; London, Oxford Univ. Press. 36s.

HUDSON, W. H., *Letters to R. B. Cunningham Graham*, ed. by R. Curle. Golden Cockerel Press. 30s.

O'CASEY, S., *Pictures in the Hallway*. London, Macmillan. 15s.

PHILLIPS, W. J., *France on Byron*. Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania.

RUBEL, V. L., *Poetic Diction in the English Renaissance from Skelton through Spenser*. New York, Mod. Lang. Assoc. Amer.; London, Oxford Univ. Press. 18s. 6d.

SITWELL, E., *Street Songs*. London, Macmillan. 3s. 6d.

SLOANE, E. H., *Robert Gould, Seventeenth Century Satirist*. Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania.

TILLOTSON, G., *Essays in Criticism and Research*. Cambridge, Univ. Press. 15s.

WIMSATT, W. K., JR., *The Prose Style of Samuel Johnson*. Yale and Oxford Univ. Presses. 18s. 6d.